THE Morning-Exercise AGAINST POPERY.

OR, THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS OF THE CHURCH of ROME

Detected and Confuted,

IN A

MORNING-LECTURE

Preached lately in *SOUTHWARK*:

By Several Ministers of the Gospel in or near LONDON.

To the law, and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them, Isa. 8. 20.

Ἡ θεόπνευστος ἡμῖν διατηράτω γραφὴ καὶ παρ' οἷς ἂν εὑρεθῇ τὰ δόγματα συμφωνοῦντα τοῖς θείοις λόγοις, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἕξει πάντως τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ ψήφος. Basilius in Ep. ad Eustathium Medicum.

Utile est libros plures a pluribus fieri, diverso stylo non diversa fide, etiam de quæstionibus iisdem; ut ad plurimos; ad alios sic; ad alios autem sic; res ipsa perveniat. Augustinus de Trinitate, lib. 1. cap. 3.

LONDON,

Printed by *A. Maxwell* for *Tho: Parkhurst*, at the Bible and three Crowns in *Cheapside* near *Mercers-Chappel*, and at the Bible within the Gate on *London-Bridg*. 1675.

330

To the READER.

THOSE Famous Miniſters of Chriſt, *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Calvin*, *Zuinglius*, *Bucer*, and the reſt of them, who juſtly are ſtiled Reformers of Religion; did ſay more againſt Popery, than any of the Papiſts have yet been able to give a ſolid Anſwer to: And indeed it was by wiſe and unintereſted men judged, above a hundred years ago, a deſperate Cauſe, being ſo much againſt both Scripture and right Reaſon. The Church of *Rome*, therefore, that it might uphold and defend it ſelf, hath had recourſe unto *Cruelty*, *Policy*, *Sophiſtry*.

As for their *Cruelty*, What place almoſt is there that rings not of it? The *Maſſacre at Paris*, the *Iriſh Rebellion*, the *Gunpowder-Treaſon*, thoſe *Flames* in which ſo many were burned in the *Perſecution under Q. Mary*; do plainly ſhew, That the *Romiſh Beaſt* is the moſt *Cruel one* that ever was, and is extreamly eager to tear in pieces all that refuſe to worſhip him. Thoſe many thouſands of Men, Women, and Children, who have been moſt barbarouſly butchered by Bloody Papiſts in *France*, in *Ireland*, in *Bohemia*, in *Piedmont*, in *England*; may inform all, what Arguments they uſe to promote their Religion, when once they have any Power in their hands; and what kind of dealing is to be expected where *Popery* ſhall prevail; unleſs there be a ſubjecting of *Bodies*, *Eſtate*, *Reaſon*, *Senſe*, *Faith*, and *Conſcience* alſo, unto their *Tyranny* and *Uſurpation*.

And leſt theſe Inſtances of Cruelty which I have mentioned, ſhould be extenuated, as making nothing againſt *Popery*, becauſe ſeveral of that Religion have condemned them; it will not be amiſs to add, That *Thuanus*, an Hiſtorian of their own, gives this information; That the Pope when he heard of the Maſſacre, from his Legate at *Paris*, read the Letter in the Conſiſtory of Cardinals, and *ſolemnly gave thanks to Almighty God for ſo great a bleſſing conferred upon the* Roman *See and the Chriſtian World*. It was alſo decreed, That a *Jubilee* ſhould be publiſhed; the Cauſes whereof, were to *return thanks to*

Hiſtoriarum lib. 53. *p.* 1604, 1605, *&c.* Nuncio de tumultu Pariſienſi allato, mirum quantâ lætitiâ Romæ exultarum eſt. Lectis in Cardinalium Senatu Pontificii Legati literis decretum eſt, ut inde rectà Pontifex cum Cardinalibus ad B. *Marci* concederet, & D. O. M. pro tanto beneficio Sedi Romanæ, orbiq; Chriſtiano collato, gratias ritu ſolenni ageret: *& lege quæ ſequuntur.*

God for destroying in France *the Enemies of the Truth and of the Church*, &c. Soon after, the Pope sent Cardinal *Ursin* in his Name to congratulate the King of *France*, who in his journey through the Cities highly commended the Faith of those Citizens who had an hand in the Massacre, and *distributed his Holiness's blessings among them.* And at *Paris*, being to perswade the reception of the Council of *Trent*, endeavoured it with this Argument, *That the memory of the late Action to be magnified in all Ages, as conducing to the glory of God, and the dignity of the holy Roman Church, might be, as it were, sealed by the approbation of the Holy Synod.*

If this Massacre be thus justified, commended, magnified, where there was also so much Treachery (for the *Protestants* were invited to a Marriage between the Houses of *Valois* and *Bourbon*; and then in the dead of the night * many thousands of them, without distinction of Age or Sex, were butchered, so that the Channels ran down with blood into the River); sure we may conclude, That the most horrid Murthers will be defended, as long as that which they call the *Catholick Religion* is thereby promoted. I grant indeed, there are some good-natur'd *Papists* which say, They dislike such bloody doings, whatever may be pretended for their justification: But 'tis more than probable, that these very Gentlemen, supposing the *Pope* had full Power to weild both Swords, if they should dare to talk against his Cruelty, would presently be *call'd*, and feel the stroke of his Swords, as *Hereticks*.

*The number of persons slain in this Massacre at *Paris*, and other places, amounted unto Thirty thousand.

Policy is another prop of *Popery*. By Policy I do not mean that Prudence in managing of State-affairs, which is joined with Integrity, Justice, Honesty; but that Craftiness and Subtilty where no regard is had either to Truth or Conscience; but any thing is done, though never so much against the Rules of Righteousness, that carnal Ends may be brought about. The Pope having arrogated such Power to himself, that he can absolve Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, can take off the obligation of Covenants and Promises, and give Dispensations to transgress the Laws of God; hereby a door is opened to all Unrighteousness, and *Papists* may be allowed to dissemble, to lye, to be perjured, as long as 'tis for the *Catholick Cause*. The Writings of *Machiavel* have been studied more throughly by many of the *Romanists*, than the Scriptures of the Apostles

and

and Prophets. And thoſe who have converſed with the *Jeſuits*, and underſtand the Myſtery of *Jeſuitiſm*, find them ſuch exact *Achitophels*, that they will counſel to any thing, though never ſo ungodly, if it tend to the upholding of their Faction.

Laſtly, For their *Sophiſtry*: In this reſpect their Schoolmen, who have endeavored to argue for *Popery*, are famous. But when what they ſay is duly weighed, it appears to be but Sophiſtry, and no more. In the main points of Controverſie between the Church of *Rome* and us, their Arguments are anſwered in theſe enſuing Sermons; the truth alſo is confirmed by Scripture and Reaſon, and then an Improvement made in order unto practice. This mixture of Polemical and Practical Divinity together, 'tis hoped will be very uſeful.

The Miniſters who preached theſe Lectures, endeavoured to accommodate themſelves to the capacity even of ordinary Hearers: For the common people, conſidering the Induſtry of *Romiſh* Emiſſaries, are in great danger of being ſeduced; and this Book, through the bleſſing of God, may be an Antidote. I could have wiſhed that the Sermons had been delivered to me all together, that they might have been printed in better order; and ſorted together according to the ſubject-matter of them. But if the *Reader* pleaſe to conſult the Table at the beginning, he may read them in order if he be ſo minded.

To conclude: Since *England* was formerly ſuch a Tributary to the See of *Rome*, and ſuch vaſt ſums of Money were carried yearly from Hence Thither; we are not to doubt but the Pope looks upon us with grief that he has loſt us, and with an earneſt deſire to regain us. His Inſtruments are more than ordinarily buſie to this End, inſomuch that *both King and Parliament have taken publick notice of it.* This Lecture therefore againſt *Popery*, is very ſeaſonable; and if (which I earneſtly beg) this Labour be made ſucceſful to reduce any of them who have been ſeduced, or to arm and defend the people againſt one of the *greateſt viſible Enemies* that Chriſt has in the world; I ſhall exceedingly rejoice, that my Pulpit was ſo much honoured by my Fathers and Brethren when they preached in it, and that ever ſuch a Project againſt *Popery* came into my mind.

NATHANAEL VINCENT.

The Theſes or Truths maintained in theſe Sermons againſt the *PAPISTS*.

I. *THE Scripture was written for the uſe of the Laity, and ſhould be tranſlated into known Tongues, that they may underſtand it; and ſhould be heard and read by them.* Text, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. Serm. 5. p. 105.

II. *The Scripture is a ſufficient Rule of Chriſtian Faith, or Record of all neceſſary Chriſtian Doctrines, without any ſupplement of unwritten Tradition, as containing any neceſſary matter of Faith; and is thus far ſufficient for the deciſion of Controverſies.* Text, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 15. Serm. 6. p. 149.

III. *The Teſtimony of the Church is not the only nor the chief reaſon of our believing the Scripture to be the Word of God.* Text, *Luke* 16. 29. Serm. 10. p. 313.

IV. *There is no External, Supream, and Infallible Judg in the Church of God, to whom all Chriſtians are obliged to ſubmit their Faith and Conſcience in all matters of Religion.* Text, *Mat.* 23. 8, 9, 10. Serm. 1. p. 1.

V. *There is no ſuch Church inſtituted by Chriſt, as all Chriſtians joined to one meer Human Head, either Perſonal or Collective: But Chriſt is the only Univerſal Head.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 12. 27, 28. Serm. 2. p. 25.

VI. *Kings and Emperors are not rightful Subjects to the Pope; neither hath he Power, for pretended or real Hereſie, to excommunicate and depoſe them, nor to abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance; but even the Clergy are ſubject to ſecular Princes, and their Bodies and Eſtates under their Government.* Text, *Acts* 26. 2. Serm. 3. p. 44.

VII. *The Pope of* Rome *is That Antichriſt, and Man of Sin, ſpoken of in the* Apocalyps, *and by the Apoſtle* Paul. Text, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 3, 4, 5 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Serm. 4. p. 80.

VIII. *The* Proteſtants *did upon juſt grounds ſeparate from the Church of* Rome. Text, *Luk.* 6. 22. Serm. 14. p. 492.

IX. *The Lord Jeſus, who is the only Foundation of his Church, is the preſerver of its Duration, in ſome meaſure, viſibly throughout all ages.* Text, *Mat.* 16. 18. Ser. 25. p. 839.

X. *The* Papiſts *dangerouſly corrupt holy Worſhip, by their ſinful Prayers to Saints and Angels.* Text, *Rom.* 10. 14. Ser. 15. p. 519.

XII. *Fur-*

XI. *Purgatory is a groundleſs and a dangerous Doctrine.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. Serm. 24. p. 813.

XII. *No Sin is in its own nature Venial, but every Sin is deadly, and deſerves eternal Damnation.* Text, *Rom.* 6. 23. Serm. 8. p. 261.

XIII. *The Good Works of believers are not meritorious of eternal Salvation.* Text, *Pſal.* 62. 12. Serm. 11. pag. 401.

XIV. *There are not any works of* Supererogation. Text, *Luke* 17. 10. Serm. 16. p. 548.

XV. *The Doctrine of Juſtification is dangerouſly corrupted in the* Roman *Church.* Text, *Rom.* 3. 24. Serm. 12. p. 441.

XVI. *'Tis not lawful to make Images of God, nor to worſhip him as repreſented by an Image; nor to direct our worſhip to an Image as a* Medium; *nor ſcandalouſly to ſeem to worſhip Images, by doing it corporally as Idolaters do, though we pretend to keep our hearts to God. And the* Papiſts *preſumptuouſly leave the ſecond Commandment out of the Decalogue.* Text, *Mat.* 4. 10. Serm. 13. p. 458.

XVII. *Publick Prayer ought not to be made in an unknown Tongue.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 14. 15. Serm. 9. p. 295.

XVIII. *The Pope and his* Clergy, *by falſe preſumptuous Pardons and Indulgences, have heinouſly injured Chriſt, the Church, and Souls of men.* Text, *Heb.* 10. 14. Serm. 19. p. 677.

XIX. *That Doctrine in the Church of* Rome *which forbids to marry, is a wicked Doctrine.* Text, 1 *Tim.* 4. 2. Serm. 17. p. 578.

XX. *The* Papal *Doctrine in denying the poſſibility of Aſſurance, is falſe, and hath a dangerous tendency to deſtroy the true Peace and Comfort of ſouls in the certain hopes of everlaſting happineſs.* Text, 2 *Pet.* 1. 10. Serm. 18. p. 617.

XXI. *Baptiſm and the Lords Supper are the only Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace under the New Teſtament.* Text, *Prov.* 30. 6. Serm. 20. 701.

XXII. *There is no ſuch thing as* Tranſubſtantiation *in the Euchariſt; and 'tis Idolatry in the* Papiſts *to worſhip the conſecrated Bread, though they think 'tis turned into the Body of Chriſt.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 24, 25. Serm. 21. p. 729.

XXIII. *The* Papiſts *go preſumptuouſly againſt the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and change and corrupt his Ordinance, and are injurious to the people, in denying the uſe of the Cup to them*

in the Lords Supper. Text, *Mat.* 26, 27, 28. Ser. 22. p 760.

XXIV. *In the Masſ there is not a true and real Sacrifice of Chriſt himſelf for the ſins of the* Dead *and* Living. Text, *Heb.* 10. 12. Ser. 23. p. 784.

XXV. *Popery is a Novelty, and the Proteſtant Religion was not only before* Luther, *but the ſame that was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtls.* Text. *Jer.* 6. 16. *ser.* 7. p. 165.

READER, The ſmaller Miſtakes are left unto your Ingenuity to Correct; the groſſer *Errata* are here amended.

ERRATA.

PAge 5, l. 16, r. *Maſter*, l. 10, r. *be*, p. 17, l. 1, r. *of thee*, p. 39, r. *deteſt*, p. 81. r. θεοὺς, p. 82, l. 15, r. *Rev.* 16. 13. p. 85, l. 7, r. *Graſerus*, p. 85, l. 38, add *bringing in*, p. 96, l. 3, *Frinſingenſis*, p. 97, l. 8, r. *then*, p. 98, r. *head*, p. 99, l. 27, r. *he looks*, p. 100, l. 23, r. *Officers*, p. 102, l. 6, r. *their*, l. 7. add *the*, l. 37, add *bid publick and open*, p. 106, l. 30, r. *turret*, p. 109, l. 27, r. *facilis*, p. 110, l. 26, r. *Scrinio*, p. 112, l. 1, r. *condonandi*, p. 113, l. 11, r. *Tarquin*, p. 118, l. 15, r. *faith one*, p. 122, l. 1, r. *let*, p. 141, l. 13, r. 12 *s.* p. 152, l. 37, r. *readineſs*, p. 155, l. 3, r. *faith*, p. 203, l. 22, r. *ingeniouſly*, p. 266, l. 34, r. *offender*, p. 272, l. 26, dele *of*, p. 292, l. 16, r. *what a madneſs*, p. 275, l. 26, r. *gold*. † Page 404, l. 8, r. *actions*, p. 405, marg. r. *de prædeſt: & grat.* l. 42, r. *on*, p. 407, l. 2, r. *inflat*, l. 25, r. *& c.* l. 36, r. *Andradius*, p. 408, l. 4, r. *ſentent.* l. 15, marg. r. *de condigno, &* l. 23, r. *convention*, l. 42, r. ἀπὸ, l. 44, r. πάν-τως, p. 409, marg. l. 5, r. παντε, p. 416. l. 8, marg. r. *conſummando*, p. 418, l. 40, r. *the end to which it is*, p. 421, l. ult. r. *Jo.* 2. *Ep.* 8. p. 422, l. 2, r. 2. *mercis*, p. 425, dele *otbe*, p. 426, marg. l. 13, r. *tribuit*, p. 442, l. 16, r. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. p. 443, l. 18, r. 1 *Jo.* 8. 9. marg. r. *& conſilii*, p. 445. l. 16, add *him*, p 447, marg. r. *dominicus*, p. 448, l. 23, add *grace*, p. 449, l. 3, r. *retractation*, p. 450. l. 17, r. *darkneſs*, p. 451, l. 10, dele *of*, l. 20, add *or others*, p. 452, l. 1, add *we may get eternal life*, p. 455, marg. dele *c.* 2. p. 456, l. 34, r. *ſo ſay*, l. 34. add *or others for them*, p. 459, l. 13, for preſently r. *pretendedly*, l. 19, for making r. *working*, p. 462, l. 2, for will r. *would*, l. 3, for part r. *piece*, l. 24, dele *one of*, l. 32, for our works r. *Civil worſhip*, p. 463, l. 11, add *alſo*, l. 22. dele *one of*, l. 23, for Proſtrating r. *proſtration*, p. 466, l. 8, for how r. *now*, p. 463, l. 16, for tranſparent r. *tranſcendent*, p.471, for lives r. *hearts*, p. 475, l. 2, for beſt r. *leſt*, p. 483, l. for alſo r. *who*, *ibid.* dele *that*, p. 489, l. 17, for may r. *muſt*, p. 492. for ſave r. *ſerve*, p. 494. for thus r. *this*, for as r. *thou*, p. 495, marg. r *Anmianus*, p. 513, r. ἀνθαιρέσοι, p. 521, l. 29, r. *intention*, l. 38, for your r. *their*, p. 525, marg. r. *Eccleſia*, for *quid*, r. *quidem*, p. 527, l. 34, for ſcorned r. *ſeemed*, p. 530, l. 13, r. *vanity*, p. 531, marg. r. *ſunt* for *ſanct*, and *ſunt* & for *ſanctus eſt*, p. 539. r. ἄλλιον, p. 547, l. 14, r. *des*, and add *des*, p. 548, marg. r. δεσπότης, p. 550, r. *here*, marg. r. *utilitas*, p. 551, r. *Matth.* 22. p. 552. r. *yea rather*, p. 553, marg. l 2, r. ἀνθρώπων, p. 555, l. ult. r. *ſtreams*, p. 557, l. 9, r. *ſhaveling*, and l. 14, for ευ r. ω, p. 558, l. 27, r. *fly*, p. 565, l. 1, for forbids r. *denies*, and l. 4, r. ἀξίως, p. 572, l. 2, for ſpiritual r. *Apoſtles*, p. 574, for Saints r. *Chriſt*, p. 580, l. 14, r. *Pſeudo-Prophetarum*, p. 583, l 35, dele *of*, p. 603, l. 13, r. καθίσανται, p. 611, l. 20, r. *Alexanders*, p. 613, l. 39, r. *inceſtuoſis*, p. 614, l. 30, r. *Setters*, l. 32, r. *backſtal*, in Tit. Ser. 18, r. *Believer his*, p. 619, marg. l. 14, r. *de ſal. Cor. ſect.* 3, p. 623, l. 42, r. δὶ καλῶν, ἔργων, p. 226, l. 13, for theirs r. *the Papiſts*, p. 627, l. 41, r. *ſingle*, p. 630, l. 13, r. *as to*, p. 632, l. 38, for way r. *Eye*, p. 635, l. 40, for theſe r. *thoſe*, p. 640, l. 40, marg. r. *incauto*, p. 641, l. 20, ὃ μετὰ λόγυ, p. 644, l. 3, r. *inartifi ſalt*, p. 648, l. 29, dele *from Eternitie*, p. 446, l. 25, dele *Colon*. * Page 701, l. 1, 4, r. *light*, l. 31, r. *tender*, p. 705, l. 13, r. *Sacraments*, p. 708, l. 20, r. vocati, l. 44, r. *commanded*, p. 710, l. 27, r. *vitæ*, p. 711, l. 14, r. *change*, p. 714, l. 34, r. *as*, p. 715. l. ult. dele *and that through final Infidelity*, p. 716, l. 39, dele *again*, p. 720, l. 41, r. *prevented*, p. 723, l. 6, that which is included in the Parentheſis ſtould have been ſet in the Margin, p. 725, l. 26, r. *counſel*, p. 726, l. 23, r. *as are intaild*, p. 727, l. 5, for their r. *both*, p. 784, for ſpeaking r. *ſpeaketh*, p. 788, dele for and for in that r. *a*, p. 790, for it is r. *he is*, p. 791, for was r. *were*, p. 796, for off from r. *of*, and dele *in*, p. 806, for at r. *of*, p. 808, dele *to underſtand*, p. 814, l. 7, r. *from*, p. 816, l. 16, for *ſuis* r. *ſum*, l. ult. r. *waſted*, p. 818, l. 15, r. *receive* p. 819, l. 2, r. *laſt*, l. 10, r. 2000, and l. 32, r. *deſining*, p. 828, l. 32, r. *juſtified* for ſanctified, p. 830, l. 39, r. *Doctor*, p. 832, l. ult. r. *mouldring*, p. 834, l. 20, r. ἀνάγκην, p. 834, l. 23, r. *called day*, p. 837, l.

POPE and COUNCILS not Infallible

Mat. 23. 8, 9, 10. *But be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Maſter, even Chriſt, and all ye are Brethren.*
And call no man your Father upon the earth, for one is your Father which is in Heaven.
Neither be ye called Maſters; for one is your Maſter, even Chriſt.

THE *But* in the beginning of theſe words hath a manifeſt reſpect unto the foregoing verſes, wherein our bleſſed Saviour deſcribes and cenſures the ambition and uſurpation of the Scribes and Phariſees. He tells you in the fifth verſe, *All their works they do to be ſeen of men*; not for the pleaſing of God, but for gaining of reputation amongſt men; not for the ſatisfaction of their own Conſciences, but for vain glory and oſtentation. *They made broad their Phylacteries*; the Phylacteries were little ſcrowls of Parchment which the *Jews* did wear upon their arms, or upon their foreheads, wherein they writ ſome parcels of the Law of God. How ſolidly grounded that practice was, I ſhall not now examine: But the Scribes and Phariſees made theſe Phylacteries larger and broader than the reſt of the *Jews*, that they might gain that reſpect from the people by their outward garb, which they could not gain by any true and ſolid worth. It follows in the ſixth verſe. *They love the uppermoſt rooms at feaſts, and the chief ſeats in the Synagogues*; and in the ſeventh verſe, *and greetings in the Markets, and to be called of men Rabbi*; i.e. *Maſter* or *Doctor*; for ſo the word ſignifies; and the word is doubled for the greater honour and reſpect. They affected titles of honour, and the *Jewiſh* Sanhedrim did ſolemnly conſer theſe titles upon learned men; and they obliged the people to give them theſe titles; and they had a ſaying, that *he that*

ſaluteth

ſaluteth his teacher as he doth another man, and doth not call him Rabbi, *provokes God to depart from Iſrael.*

But indeed there was a deeper and worſe deſign than this in it; they did not only aim at ſplendid and glorious titles, but they did uſurp Authority and Dominion over the Conſciences of the People, whereof this was but a ſign; as amongſt us the Flag is a ſign of the Dominion of the Seas, ſo this title was an indication and ſign of that Authority they uſurped over the people. Againſt this leaven of the Scribes and Phariſees, our Saviour cautions them in the words read, *Be ye not called Rabbi, call no man your Father upon earth; neither be ye called Maſters.* The ſame thing thrice repeated in various expreſſions, to ſhew the *great importance* and *neceſſity* of this precept. But how is this to be underſtood? I anſwer, it is not a prohibition concerning the *uſe of the name*, but concerning the *practice of the thing*. You are not to underſtand it thus, as if it were unlawful to call any man *Father*, or *Maſter*, as the *Quakers* with ſufficient weakneſs will underſtand it. Certainly the Apoſtles beſt underſtood the meaning of their Lord and Maſter; and for as much as we find that they themſelves did give men theſe titles, we have warrant enough to uſe them, *Epheſ.* 6. 4. *Fathers provoke not your Children to wrath*; and leſt any man ſhould have ſuch an Allegorical humour as to underſtand it of ſpiritual Fathers, they are called *fathers of the fleſh*, *Heb.* 12. 9. *We have had fathers of our fleſh.* And ſo ſervants muſt *obey in all things their Maſters according to the fleſh*, Col. 3. 22. nay more, it is not unlawful to call teachers by theſe names, it is not unlawful to call Teachers, *Maſters, Doctors, Rabbies*, 1 Cor. 4. 15. *For though you have ten thouſand inſtructers in Chriſt, yet have you not many Fathers, for in Chriſt Jeſus I have begotten you through the Goſpel:* I am your Father, your ſpiritual Father, and the title of *Maſter* (διδάσκαλος) anſwers to *Rabbi* in the Hebrew, as the learned know, and plainly appears from *Joh.* 20. 16. *Jeſus ſaid unto her Mary, ſhe turned her ſelf about and ſaid, Rabboni!* a word of the ſame ſignification with *Rabbi*, which is as much as to ſay *Maſter.* This name I ſay, is commonly given to Teachers and Miniſters of the Goſpel; *he ſent ſome Apoſtles, and ſome teachers or Maſters*, διδασκάλους, and ſo St. *Paul* calls himſelf διδάσκαλος, *a teacher, a Maſter, a Doctor of the Gentiles.*

What then is here forbidden?

Anſ. Two things. (1) He forbids a vain and ambitious affectation of ſuch titles of honour as theſe. (2) And principally he forbids that Authority and Dominion over the Conſciences of men which theſe titles do import. I ſhall ſay nothing to the former, the latter is that I muſt diſcourſe of at this time. And to this purpoſe, and that you may the better underſtand the mind of our bleſſed Saviour in theſe words; you muſt know that the Scribes and Phariſees did arrogate to themſelves this Authority over the people, the ſelf-ſame Power which the Popiſh teachers at this day uſurp over their people. This was their doctrine,

ctrine, That the People were obliged to believe all their Doctrines, and to practiſe all their Injunctions. Theſe are the very words of the *Jewiſh Talmud*, which is as it were their Bible. *All the words of our Rabbins are to be believed, and received, as the very words of the living God.* And in another place, *We owe the ſame faith to all which the Rabbins teach in their homilies, which we give to the Law of Moſes.* Nay they went ſo far as to ſay, (as Rabbi *Solomon* an eminent Doctor of theirs ſaith upon *Deut.* 17. 11.) *Thou ſhalt not depart from the words of the wiſe*, i.e. *their Teachers, though they tell thee that thy right hand is thy left, and thy left hand is thy right*; and in another place, *he that diſſents from his Teachers, is as bad as he that diſſents from the Divine Majeſty; and he that believes the words of the wiſe, it is as if he did believe God himſelf.* Nay they went higher, *My Son attend rather to the words of the Scribes than to the words of the Law.*

Now by this you may clearly underſtand what our Saviour aims at, and why he preſſeth this point with ſo much vehemency; you ſee the very life and ſoul of Religion was ſtruck at by this intolerable Uſurpation. Therefore our Saviour ſaith, *call no man Rabbi, call no man your Father upon earth*; let none of my Diſciples or Apoſtles ever uſurp this Authority; and if any of them ſhould be ſo arrogant as to do it, let no man give this title to them; that is, acknowledg not this Authority to be in them; own no man for your Father or Maſter on Earth, except my ſelf or your Father in Heaven.

From the words thus explained I gather this Doctrine.

Doct. *There is no external, ſupream and infallible Judg in the Church of God, to whom all Chriſtians are obliged to ſubmit their Faith and Conſciences, in all matters of Religion.*

This was the point that I was deſired to diſcourſe of at this time; and I do it the more willingly, becauſe in the whole body of Popery, the oppoſite Doctrine to this is the heart of it. This is *Articulus ſtantis, vel cadentis Papiſmi:* Popery will either ſtand or fall by the truth or falſhood of this Aſſertion. It is uſual with Papiſts confidently to invite us to the debate of this Doctrine, concerning the ſupream and infallible Judg of Controverſies; this they all acknowledg, ſtrikes at the root; and we do but nibble at the branches, unleſs we ſtrike at this.

Now that you may the better underſtand this Diſcourſe, I muſt acquaint you with the Doctrine of the Papiſts in this particular. They are not content with Chriſt the Judg in Heaven, and the holy Scriptures the Judg upon Earth; but they muſt have another Judg, a viſible Judg; like the Iſraelites they muſt have a viſible God to go before them, though it be but a Calf. They ſay (1) that an external and viſible Judg of all matters of Religion upon Earth is abſolutely neceſſary; and this Judg they ſay is the Church, by which they underſtand

the Governours of the Church, either the Pope, as ſome of them ſay, or as others, a General Council, or the Pope and a Council together, as thoſe that would ſeem wiſer than the reſt pretend.

(2) They ſay, this ſupream Judg is infallible; he can neither be deceived himſelf, nor deceive them that ſtick to him, and are taught by him.

(3) They ſay it is the duty of every particular Chriſtian intirely and unreſervedly to ſubmit his Faith and Conſcience to the conduct and guidance of this Judg, to believe whatever he teacheth, and to practiſe whatever he commands, according to that known and often mentioned, and never to be forgotten Aſſertion of *Bellarmine*, *De Pontifice Rom.* l. 4. cap. 5. *in fine. If*, ſaith he, *the Pope could or ſhould ſo far err, as to command the practice of vice, and to forbid vertuous actions, the Church were bound to believe vices to be good, and vertues to be bad.* This is plain dealing; and I cannot but adore the wiſe and wonderful Providence of God, that ſhould give up a perſon of ſuch wiſdom and learning as *Bellarmine*, to diſcover the true and the deſperate conſequences of this principle, that all men that have a care of their Souls might avoid and abhor it.

This is the ſum of their Doctrine; and they further add, that this Doctrine of the Churches ſupream and infallible Authority, as it is of more weight and importance, ſo it is, and in all reaſon ought to be more evident and demonſtrable than any other Chriſtian Doctrine whatſoever, as a learned Doctor of the *Romiſh* Church expreſly affirms, I mean *Creſſy* in his *Exomologeſis*; whether this be ſo or no we ſhall by and by diſcern. And againſt this bold and wicked Aſſertion I have laid down this Propoſition, *There is no external ſupream, infallible Judg in the Church of God, to whom all Chriſtians are obliged to ſubmit their Faith and Conſciences in all matters of Religion.* That which I am now pleading for is, that you may preſerve the greateſt treaſure you have in the world, even your Conſciences, againſt the horrible uſurpations of wicked and unreaſonable men. I ſhall not uſe multitudes of Arguments to confute the Popiſh Aſſertion, but a few, and thoſe ſuch as may convince the Conſcience of any perſon, who will not ſhut his eyes againſt the light.

Arg. 1. This Authority which they pretend to is a greater Authority than the Apoſtles themſelves did ever claim, or exerciſe in the Church of God; as plainly appears from 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. *Not that we have dominion over your Faith.* I do not underſtand what dominion over a mans Faith can be, if this that they pretend to be not ſo. God himſelf can ſcarce be imagined to have a greater dominion over any mans Faith than this, that a man be obliged to believe every thing which God ſaith without examination, and practiſe whatſoever he commands; and this the Pope lays claim to, as you have heard, and it is notoriouſly known; by which alone you may ſufficiently diſcern who is that Man of Sin propheſied of, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4. *Who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above*

above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; ſo that he as God ſitteth in the Temple of God, ſhewing himſelf that he is God. This was our bleſſed Saviours ſole Prerogative, *Act.* 3. 22. *Moſes truly ſaid unto the Fathers, a Prophet ſhall the Lord your God raiſe up unto you of your brethren like unto me, him ſhall ye hear; in all things whatſoever he ſhall ſay unto you.* So that this is the heighth of Chriſts honour; and the truth is, it might well be ſaid of Chriſt, we may ſafely relie upon and hear Chriſt in all things whatſoever he ſhould ſay to us; this was very agreeable to the nature and perſon of Chriſt, one *in whom were all the treaſures of wiſdom and knowledg, one in whom the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt bodily*, one that was *God manifeſted in the fleſh:* I ſay, we may ſafely relie upon ſuch a perſon; but that this ſhould be ſaid of a weak and wicked man, ſuch as themſelves confeſs many of their Popes to have been, that we ſhould hear whatever he ſays; this is ſuch a ſtupendious uſurpation, that I can never think of it with horror enough. The holy Apoſtles thought it good manners to keep a diſtance from their Lord and maker, they never durſt arrogate ſuch an abſolute and unlimited Authority to themſelves. Witneſs that evident place, *Gal.* 1. 8, 9. *Though we or an Angel from heaven preach any other Goſpel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed.* And as I ſaid before, ſo ſay I now again, *If any man* (be what he will, the Pope or a Council, or any company of men, for *ubi lex non diſtinguit, non eſt diſtinguendum*, God makes no difference or exception here, neither muſt we) *preach any other Goſpel unto you than that you have received, let him be accurſed.* And do you not think this would be another Goſpel if any man ſhould ſay, that vices were vertues, and ſins duties, and conſequently that unbelief and impenitency were Goſpel-duties, would not this be another Goſpel? and you ſee they allow this Authority to the Pope. If the Pope teach ſo, you are bound to believe ſo; but this was not Saint *Pauls* mind, *Though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Goſpel*, do not only disbelieve him, but curſe him to his face; it may be he will curſe you, and pronounce an Anathema againſt you, and roar with his Bulls againſt you; but regard not that, *the curſe cauſleſs ſhall not come*, Prov. 26. 2. but the curſe ſhall reſt upon himſelf.

Arg. 2. Such an Authority as they pretend to, is contrary to that command of the trial of Doctrines, which is laid upon all Chriſtians; for if there be an infallible Judg to whom I ought to ſubmit my Faith and Conſcience in all matters of Religion, what need I try Doctrins? certainly there is no room left for it; and therefore the Papiſts laying down that Aſſertion, they do with very good ſenſe collect this Concluſion from it, That you owe an implicite Faith to all their Doctrins, and blind obedience to all their commands; it is *Bellarmines* Aſſertion, *A Chriſtian*, ſaith he, *ſhould receive all the Doctrins of the Church without any examination.* Now let us ſee whether this be the mind of God or no; if it be, than they are in the right; if not, than it is an abomina-

ble

ble Uſurpation. If we conſult the holy Scriptures, we ſhall find that no Chriſtian is to offer to God a blind ſacrifice, but a reaſonable ſervice. 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. *Be ready always to give an anſwer to every man that asketh you a reaſon of the hope that is in you.* It is not the Colliers reaſon will ſerve the turn, nor the Colliers Faith, to believe he knows not why; this is not to give a reaſon of our hope, 1 *Joh.* 4. 1. *Beloved, believe not every ſpirit* (that is every teacher that pretends to be led by the ſpirit) *but try the ſpirits whether they are of God; becauſe many falſe Prophets are gone out into the world.* God hath given us ſufficient warning, that there ſhould be a great and a general defection amongſt Profeſſors, yea amongſt the Preachers of the Goſpel, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. *Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that in the latter times ſome ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and Doctrines of Devils.* Act. 20. 30. *Alſo of your own ſelves ſhall men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw away Diſciples after them, &c.* 2 Pet. 2. 1, 2. *But there were falſe Prophets alſo amongſt the people, even as there ſhall be falſe Teachers among you, who privily ſhall bring in damnable hereſies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and many ſhall follow their pernicious ways.* Well now, what is the remedy againſt this doleful diſeaſe? be not ſurprized when you ſee various and contrary opinions in the Church; it is no more than was foretold by all the Apoſtles. But now what ſhall Chriſtians do in this diſtreſſed condition and contradiction of opinions? what was the remedy preſcribed in caſe of falſe Prophets of old? and what is the remedy in caſe of falſe Teachers now? Why it is trial. Chriſtians are commanded to try them. There were two ways propoſed to try the Prophets of old; the one was by the event. *Deut.* 18. 21, 22. *And if thou ſay in thine heart, how ſhall we know the word which the Lord hath not ſpoken, when the Prophet ſpeaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to paſs, that is the thing which the Lord hath not ſpoken; but the Prophet hath ſpoken it preſumptuouſly, thou ſhalt not be afraid of him.* And the other way of trial was by the Scripture, *Iſa.* 8. 20. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them*; and Ver. 16. *Bind up the Teſtimony, ſeal the Law among my Diſciples.* And *Verſ.* 18, 19. *Behold I and the Children whom the Lord hath given me are for ſigns and for wonders in Iſrael, and when they ſhall ſay unto you, ſeek unto them that have familiar ſpirits, and unto wizards, that peep, and that mutter, ſhall not a people ſeek unto their God? for the living to the dead?* The way to diſcover theſe deluſions is to enquire, and that is by the Law and by the Teſtimony, and this the people were obliged to. And ſo this is the remedy preſcribed in the New Teſtament; I need inſtance but in that place, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 21. *Prove all things, hold faſt that which is good.* Prove all things, who is this that is required to do it? it may be it is the Pope, it may be it is a general Council, and they indeed muſt prove all things; no, read the firſt verſe of the firſt Chapter, *Paul and Sylvanus, and Timotheus unto the Church of the Theſſalonians*

in

in God our Father; the Members of the Church, theſe are here commanded to prove all things, and hold faſt that which is good. The ſame perſons are obliged to *prove all things*, who are obliged *to hold faſt that which is good*: and ſince it is confeſſed the latter clauſe belongs to the people, ſo muſt the former alſo. Conſider three things. (1.) Chriſtians have Ability to try things with. (2.) They have a Rule to try things by. And (3.) They have a Promiſe of diſcovery; and I think more is not neceſſary.

Firſt, Chriſtians have Ability to try things with, they have reaſonable faculties, they are capable of judging between things that differ; the Apoſtle ſpeaks to the Church of the *Corinthians*; 1 Cor. 10. 15. *I ſpeak as to wiſe men, judg ye what I ſay.* Chriſtians, as well as Miniſters, have the Spirit of God which enables them to judg of ſpiritual things. 2 *Cor.* 2. 15. *He that is ſpiritual* (that is, he that hath the Spirit of God) *judgeth all things.* He is capable of judging between Doctrine and Doctrine, between Precept and Precept, between Practice and Practice; and upon the warrant of this Text, and many others, I dare affirm, that a ſerious, godly, diſcreet Chriſtian, is a more competent judge of many divine Truths, than the greateſt Scholar in the World, that wants the direction of the Spirit of God: add to this what our Saviour ſaith, *John* 10. 4, 5. and remember he ſpeaks not of the Shepherds, but of the Sheep; *my ſheep hear my voice, and they follow me; a ſtranger they will not follow, but will fly from him: for they know not the voice of ſtrangers.* You ſee the Sheep are indued by God with faculties, they can diſtinguiſh between Chriſt and a Stranger, between Chriſt and Anti-chriſt.

Secondly, Chriſtians have a certain Rule to try things by, and that is the holy Scriptures, to which Chriſt commanded the Jews to bring all his doctrines, Joh. 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures.* Acts 17. 11. *Theſe were more noble than thoſe in Theſſalonica, in that they received the word with all readineſs of mind, and ſearched the Scriptures dayly whether thoſe things were ſo.* 2 Pet. 1. 19. *We have alſo a more ſure word of Prophecy* (the Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament* compared with the events and doctrines of the *New*) *whereunto you do well that you take heed, as unto a light that ſhineth in a dark place.* Pray obſerve, 1. Who writes this, it is *Peter*, he from whom the Pope claims all the power he hath; and yet *Peter* ſaith, you do well to take heed to the Scriptures. I know the Popes are grown wiſer ſince, they have corrected *Peter*; they ſay, People do ill to take heed to the Scriptures; they ſay, it is the fountain of all hereſie, for people to ſtudy the Scripture: our Saviour ſaid, it was the fountain of all error that men did not underſtand the Scriptures; *You err, becauſe you know not the Scriptures.* Matt. 22. 29. The Pope ſaith, Men err becauſe they will know and read the Scriptures. 2. To whom he writes this, look upon the endorſement of his Epiſtle: Peradventure he writes thus to his Succeſſors; No, but *to them:*

them that have obtained like precious faith with us, v. 1. of this chapter.

Thirdly, Christians have a promise of discovery upon Trial; 2 *Prov.* 4. 5. *If thou seekest her* (that is wisdom) *as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledg of God*; Joh. 7. 17. *If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of my self.*

Arg. 3. Against the Supremacy and the infallible Authority of the Pope is taken from the danger of following false guides. People may sin in following their guides and teachers; this the Papists deny; they say that People are obliged to believe their Teachers, and if they do so, they are free from sin and danger; and if their Doctrine be true, it must needs be so. This is that I must now briefly examine, as that which alone will decide the whole controversy; when *Aaron* taught the people to worship the golden calf, and proclaim'd, *to morrow is a feast unto the Lord*, *Exod.* 32. 5. Did the people sin in obeying *Aarons* doctrine, and complying with his precepts, or did they not? I think nothing is more plain, than that they did sin in it: *vers.* 31. *And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh! this people hath sinned a great sin.* Not only *Aaron* sinned in teaching this doctrine, but the people sinned in believing this doctrine: and in *Vers.* 35. *And the Lord plagued the people because they made the calfe which Aaron made*, or, as the words may very well be interpreted, *because they worshipped the calfe, or sacrificed to the calfe, which Aaron made.*

So you see plainly, the people sinned, and were plagued because they followed the Doctrine of *Aaron*: and so in *Isa.* 3. 12. *O my people, they which lead thee, cause thee to err*, by their corrupt doctrines and sinful practices; and yet this did not at all excuse them: for *Isa.* 24. 1, 2, 3. *Behold, the Lord maketh the earth* (that is, the Land) *empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof; and it shall be, as with the people, so with the priest, as with the servant so with his master*, as with the leader so with the follower: The Priest shall be punished sorely for misguiding the people, and the people shall be punished for following them. To come lower, to the Priests and Rulers of the Church in our blessed Saviours time, the chief Priest and the great Council at *Jerusalem* then were, as the Papists confess, the supreme and infallible Judges of all the matters of Religion, as the Pope at least with a general Council pretends to be at this day. These infallible Judges, are called *blind guides*, Matt. 23. 16. *Woe unto you blind guides*; they were universally enemies to Christ; *John* 7. 48. *Have any of the Rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?* They accounted Christ an impostor; *Matt.* 27. 63. The very words of their great Council are these, *Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, after three days I will*

rise

riſe again; theſe were the men that ſtirred up the people againſt Chriſt. *Matt.* 27. 20. *But the chief Prieſts and Elders perſwaded the multitude, that they ſhould ask Barrabas, and deſtroy Jeſus.* You ſee nothing is more plain; no adverſary can be ſo impudent as to deny this, that the high Prieſts and the great Council of the Jews did unanimouſly agree in preaching this Doctrine, that Chriſt was a deceiver. Now the queſtion is, whether the people did well in believing this Doctrine, or not. Certainly if the Popiſh Doctrine be true, the people did well in following the high Prieſts direction, and ſo the Papiſts affirm; they are the words of *Becanus*, in his *Manual of Controverſies*, *The whole people of the Jews, in the matters of Religion were bound to follow what the high Prieſt ſaid*, and the greateſt of their Divines, even *Bellarmine* expreſly ſays, that *the people were bound to ſtand to the high Prieſts judgment; whatſoever ſentence he ſhould deliver.* Now we ſay, they did ſin in believing their Teachers; let us both hear what Chriſt ſays, and no more need be ſaid againſt this abominable Aſſertion, nor for the deciding of this queſtion, and eſtabliſhing you againſt this Doctrine. What can be more plain than that paſſage of our Saviours, *Matt.* 15. 14? *Let them alone, they be blind leaders of the blind, and if the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.* You ſee, he that follows a blind leader is puniſhed as well as he that leads him, both fall into the Ditch. And *Acts* 3. 17. When the Apoſtle was Preaching to the Jews, *I wot*, ſays he, *that through ignorance you did it*, (that is, you crucified Chriſt) *as did alſo your rulers.* Ignorance it was in the Prieſts, and ignorance it was in the people; and the people, ſay the Papiſts, are excuſable, becauſe they were bound to follow the Prieſts; but did this make it no ſin in the people? Let us hear what Saint *Peter* ſays, *Acts* 2. 23. *Him, being delivered by the determinate counſel and foreknowledg of God you have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and ſlain:* Neither Gods decree, nor the high Prieſts miſguidance did at all excuſe them from that wicked act; and as they ſaid, *His blood be upon us and our children*, ſo we ſee that ſad Curſe is upon them to this day; *Wrath is come upon them to the uttermoſt*, as the Apoſtle ſays, 1 *Theſ.* 2. 16. And if we ſearch this matter a little further, it will more evidently appear, and indeed afford another undeniable Argument to confirm this Truth. Here were two contrary Authorities, God and Chriſt in his name on the one ſide, and the Authority of the Church on the other ſide. Chriſt commands the Jews to believe in him, *John* 6. 29. when they asked him, *What ſhall we do that we may work the works of God?* What does God require of us? Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto them, *This is the work of God, that you believe on him whom he hath ſent:* and the great Doctrine, you know, Preached by Chriſt, was, *Repent and believe the Goſpel*; and Chriſt tells them, *Joh.* 3. 36. *He that believeth on the Son hath everlaſting life, and he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* And the Arguments our Saviour brings to prove

himself to be the Messias, and to oblige them to believe, they are principally two. The first is the works he did, *Joh.* 5. 36. *The works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.* And the second is the Scriptures, *vers.* 39. of that Chapter, *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testifie of me*; and in vers. 46. *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me*; this for the one side. On the other side stands the Authority of the Church, the Supream and Infallible Judg of Controversies, as the Papists say these were; *The chief Priests and Elders, and all the Council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death*, Mat. 26. 59. and *vers.* 65. the high Priest pronounceth, *he hath spoken blasphemy, what further need have we of witnesses, behold now you have heard his blasphemy, what think ye?* and the rest consent to his sentence; vers. 66. *and they answered and said, he is guilty of death.* And *the Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue*, Joh. 9. 22.

Now then the question lies here, whether the *Jews* were obliged to believe Christ in this case, or whether they were obliged to believe the High Priest and Sanhedrim, and the Church of the *Jews*. And methinks the very mentioning of it should presently determine it in all your thoughts; it is so prodigious a thing that the Church should set up it self in opposition to Christ, that no man can hear it without tingling ears. Saint *Peter* hath decided it, *Act.* 5. 29. *Then Peter and the other Apostles answered and said, we ought to obey God rather than man*; we ought to believe God rather than man. Can any man that hath the understanding of a man in him, or the Conscience of a Christian, think that the people of the *Jews*, that the Disciples and Apostles of our Lord did sin in believing in him, because it was contrary to the command of the High Priest and Church of the *Jews*? Can any man think their Unbelief was their duty? or that the Authority of the Church could make void the command of God? or that the *Jews* did but their duty in believing Christ to be a deceiver? These are stupendious and prodigious assertions; and yet all these and many more must be digested, or else they must part with their fundamental Doctrine. And just as the case of the *Jews* was then, so is our case now; for example, God clearly and plainly commands me, as plainly as words can express it, *Exod.* 20. 4, 5. *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the Earth beneath, or that is in the water under the Earth, thou shalt not bow down thy self to them, nor serve them.* And *Mat.* 4. 10. says our Saviour, *It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* The Church of *Rome* comes and teaches us a quite contrary doctrine; they say, *thou shalt worship graven Images, and Saints, and Angels, and not God only*; the question is, which of these two we must believe, and whose command we ought to obey? whether the Children must obey

God

God their Father, or the Church their Mother? whether I muſt believe the Word of God, which is confeſt to be ſo by the Papiſts themſelves, or the word of man, which they vainly pretend to be the Word of God? let the 1 *Joh.* 5. 9. determine this Controverſie, *if we receive the witneſs of man, the witneſs of God is greater.* The witneſs of God certainly ought to be preferred before the witneſs of man; add to this *Mat.* 15. 6. *You have made the commandment of God of none effect by your Traditions.* And verſ. 9. *in vain do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men*; and tell me what is it to make void the commandments of God by mens Traditions, if this be not?

Arg. 4. *and laſt.* Againſt this Doctrine is from the want of a Divine Appointment and Promiſe; we muſt remember the queſtion our Saviour puts, *Luk.* 12. 14. *Man, who made me a judg or a divider over you?* And that paſſage, *Heb.* 5. 4. *No man taketh this honour to himſelf, but he that was called of God as was Aaron.* If there be ſuch a Soveraign and Infallible Judg as the *Papiſts* pretend there is, and the *Pope* be he, this Judg ought in all reaſon to produce his commiſſion, and ſhew his letters patents for it. It is confeſſed on all hands that man is of himſelf a vain and fooliſh creature, full of ignorance, apt to error, that loves darkneſs rather than light; *Men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lye,* Pſal. 62. 9. the minds of all men do need renovation, or elſe they are not capable of diſcerning Divine things. Now if any man pretend to an exemption from the common infirmities and corruptions of humane nature, this man ought to produce his writ of priviledg, and to ſhew wherein, and how he hath ſuch an exemption. Certainly if any pretends to be infallibly guided by God in all things, he can claim it only from the grace of God, and by vertue of Gods Promiſe; but ſuch Promiſe there is none. I acknowledg the Papiſts pretend they have ſuch a promiſe, that I ſhall next examine. And here are two things to be enquired into: (1) To whom this commiſſion and promiſe is given, and this is the foundation of all the reſt; for though it ſhould appear, that God had made a Promiſe of infallible guidance to ſome perſon or perſons; yet unleſs it plainly appear to whom that promiſe is made, no man can lay claim to it, or have any benefit by it.

Now let us enquire to whom this Promiſe is made; the Papiſts ſay, it is made to the Church; but, ſay I, what do they mean by the Church? ſay they, it is to the Governours of the Church; but go a little further, and what do they mean by the Governours of the Church? and herein they moſt horribly break into pieces; this Doctrine they ſay, as you have heard, is of more importance than any Doctrine whatſoever, and ſo ought to be proved with the greater evidence, than any other. But when we come to examine it, their evidences are ſo obſcure and inevident that they are not ſufficient to convince their own Brethren; It belongs ſay ſome of them to the Pope, to the Biſhop of *Rome*; ſay others,

no, it belongs to a General Council, and these opinions are quite contrary one to another; and this difference is not only amongst obscure and private persons, but their greatest Doctors; there is University against University, City against City, Kingdom against Kingdom. So that till they be agreed, to whom this Promise is made, they can make no benefit of the claim, nor are we obliged to follow them.

2. Where this Grant and Promise is? the Papists answer, it is contained in the holy Scriptures; and here they muster up some Promises as they call them, that confer this privilege either upon the Pope, or a General Council; and this I shall briefly examine. Only in general observe three things.

1. More clear and expres Promises than any they pretend to did not secure the Church of God formerly from error, and therefore it is a vain thing for them to expect it now. I will deal so charitably with our adversaries, because they want proofs as to help the infirmity of their cause. We will suppose there were such a text as this, *In the Church of Rome shall my name be for ever*; sure they would desire no more than this; they would say, it is plain from hence that the Church of *Rome* is infallible. But I say, if there were so plain a proof, yet that would not be sufficient to prove it infallible, or to secure the Church from Error, and that I will prove by a plain instance. God speaks concerning the Temple of *Jerusalem*, 2 Chron. 7. 16. *For now I have chosen and sanctified this house which thou hast built, to put my name there for ever, and mine eyes, and my heart shall be there perpetually.* You see, here is the same Promise which I supposed made to *Jerusalem*; but how far this was from securing the Church of *Jerusalem*, the high Priests and his Brethren from Error and Apostacy, doth sufficiently appear from those frequent and grievous complaints of the Prophets, concerning the universal depravation of that Church, and particularly of the Priests of it, from the instances of the gross errors and miscarriages of the High Priests and others; and particularly it is put out of all dispute by that fatal and damnable Error of that Church in the condemnation of Christ.

2. Gods Promise of leading them into all truth is suspended upon certain conditions. The Spirit of truth you know is only promised to them that ask him, *Luk.* 11. 13. *How much more shall your heavenly father give the holy Spirit to them that ask him*; and it is supposed that they must ask aright; for *you ask and receive not, because you ask amiss*, Jam. 4. 3. and in the place forementioned, *Joh.* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he shall know the Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of my self*; where you see the knowing of the Doctrine of Christ is suspended upon the doing of Gods will. Now then for as much as the Church of *Rome* hath apparently broken the condition God requires, as no man that reads their own Historians can doubt, no wonder if God according to his commination in that case, *make them to know his breach of Promise.*

3. The

3. The Promiſes which they pretend to are ſo dark and obſcure that they do not convince many of their own Brethren; therefore it is a ridiculous thing to think they ſhould convince Proteſtants. For inſtance, I told you they were horribly divided in that fundamental Doctrine of the Infallible Judg, that ſome place this Infallibility in the Pope, and others in the Council. Now whereas the Promiſes they pretend to are of two ſorts, ſome pretend this Infallible Authority to be in the Pope, and ſome in a General Council. Thoſe that ſay it is in the Pope, do both ſlight and diſpute againſt thoſe arguments that are brought to prove it to be in the Council, and on the contrary thoſe that believe the Infallibility to be in the Council, deſpiſe and confute thoſe Arguments which are brought for the Infallibility of the Pope. This being premiſed, I come particularly, but briefly (becauſe I have diſcuſſed them elſewhere) to the Promiſes pretended for this uſurped Authority. Firſt for the Pope, and then for the Council.

For the Pope they tell us this ſtory; That Saint *Peter* was made by Chriſt the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Matters and Controverſies of Religion, and that *Peters* Succeſſors, the Popes and Biſhops of *Rome* are inveſted with the ſame Authority and Priviledg; and this they ſay, is evident from Scripture, and hath been owned by the Church of God in all ages from Chriſts time till *Luthers* days: this is the *Romiſh* Legend, to which I anſwer; this Doctrine hath no foundation in Scripture; the places they alledg for it are principally two.

1. Their firſt place is *Mat.* 16. 18. *And I ſay alſo unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* Therefore *Peter*, and conſequently all his Succeſſors the Popes, are the Rock upon which the Church is built; and therefore have the Supream and Infallible Judgment, to whom all perſons muſt ſubmit their Faith and Practice.

Anſ. 1. It is plain enough, that it is not *Peters* Perſon, but *Peters* Doctrine which our Saviour doth here ſpeak of. *Peter* had made a glorious confeſſion, *verſ.* 16. *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God*; and *verſ.* 17. *Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto him, bleſſed art thou Simon Barjonas; for fleſh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven.* And for a further confirmation of this Truth, he adds, *I ſay unto thee, thou art Peter*, (he mentions *Peters* name by way of alluſion), *and upon this Rock*, that is, this Confeſſion made and delivered by thee, *I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

2. If it were *Peters* perſon, and if he were called a Rock, and a Foundation of the Church, yet all this will not prove him to be infallible, much leſs his Succeſſors. The proper and primary Foundation of the Church *Peter* was not; witneſs that evident place, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jeſus Chriſt*; in a ſecondary and Miniſterial ſenſe *Peter* was a Foundation, and ſo were all the

the reſt of the Apoſtles; 2 *Epheſ.* 2. 20. *You are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets*; *i.e.* upon the Doctrine delivered by the Apoſtles and Prophets not upon their Perſons (for then the Prophets could never have come in for a ſhare), and therefore in like manner (if you will allow Scripture to be its own interpreter) when *Peter* is called a Rock or Foundation, it is not his Perſon, but his Doctrine to which that title belongs. *Rev.* 21. 14. *The wall of the City* (the new Jeruſalem, the Church of God) *had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apoſtles of the Lamb.* Here is no prerogative of *Peter*, but all are equally foundations.

3. The Promiſe of Infallibility doth not belong to *Peter*, but unto the Church, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*; prevail againſt what or whom? againſt the Church; it is not the Rock upon which the Church is built, but the Church which is built upon that Rock, unto which that ſecurity is promiſed; he doth not ſay, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt thee*, much leſs doth he ſay, the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt thy Succeſſors to the end of the world; but *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church.* So that though *Peter* dies, and all his Succeſſors ſhould prove (as a great number of the Popes have done) Apoſtates from the Faith yet ſtill the Church remains built upon the Rock.

4. This Promiſe is made to the true, inviſible and ſincere Profeſſors of the Goſpel-Church; this is evident from the accompliſhment of the Promiſe. The Promiſe is, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church*; and it is manifeſt the gates of hell did and do prevail againſt all other perſons except the ſincere Profeſſors of the Goſpel; therefore thoſe perſons that are ſaid to be Infallible, and ſecure againſt all danger, are only the true and inviſible members of the Church.

2. The other place is, *Luk.* 22. 31, 32. *And the Lord ſaid, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath deſired to have you, that he may ſift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not:* therefore, ſay they, *Peter* did not err in the Faith, and conſequently the Popes his Succeſſors, cannot err; but alas, what vain and ridiculous Arguments are theſe? Nothing is more evident, than that this Promiſe, or Prayer rather of Chriſt doth not concern any Infallibility in the Doctrine of Faith, but his eſtabliſhment in the grace of Faith; if you conſider *Peter* was not ſo much miſtaken in his judgment, the opinion of *Peter* concerning Chriſt was not changed, it was not ſo much an error of his mind as an error in his practice. *Peter* was afraid of ſuffering, and ſlaviſh fear made him ſpeak againſt his own Conſcience, when he ſaid, *I know not the man*; and his miſcarriage was in his tongue, not in his judgment; ſo that it is plain it was the grace of Faith that was there ſhaken, and not the Doctrine of Faith, and therefore no Infallibility can be pretended from it. And here I might deſiſt, but for more abundant confutation of this abſurd and abominable Doctrine, I ſhall ſhew that as they cannot prove it from

from Scripture, we can diſprove it from Scripture. I hope I ſhall make it plain from Scripture, that the Doctrine of *Peters* Infallibility and Supream Authority in the Church of God was not received after Chriſts death; for this I ſhall offer two Arguments.

1. That *Peter* no where challengeth this power.

2. The Apoſtles no where give it him; therefore it is an intolerable arrogance that his Succeſſors ſhould claim it.

1. *Peter* did not challenge it. It is obſervable, that in the Goſpel of *Mark*, which the learned believe was indited by *Peters* direction, there is not ſo much as a repetition of that famous Text, *Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church.* *Peter* durſt not have omitted it, if it had been ſo fundamental a Doctrine as the Papiſts would have it. And afterward *Peter* writes two Epiſtles, and there is not one ſyllable in either of them concerning this Authority; but ſome may poſſibly ſay, this was *Peters* modeſty, that he would not take it to himſelf. But certainly *Peter* durſt not exerciſe his modeſty to the impeachment of his fidelity, and the concealment of ſo neceſſary and important a Truth; but he would and ought to have done as *Paul* did, who when his Authority was oppoſed by falſe Teachers, he aſſerts and vindicates, and (as himſelf expreſſeth it) *magnifieth his office*, Rom. 11. 13. and ſo no doubt *Peter* would and ſhould have done had he really had that Supream Power which the Papiſts for their own ſakes would faſten upon him; and becauſe he did not, it is a great preſumption he had it not.

2. The other Apoſtles no where give this honour to *Peter*, but rather by their practices ſhew themſelves to be of a contrary opinion; which I think will be ſufficiently evident to all ſober diſcreet and diſintereſſed perſons from two places of Scriptures, which methinks might ſuffice for the determination of this Controverſie.

The one is, *Act.* 15. where I muſt firſt remind you that at this time our bleſſed Saviour was dead, and Saint *Peter* by the Doctrine of the Papiſts, was ſuppoſed to be in the actual exerciſe of his Headſhip over the Church, to be the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Controverſies; and if they ſay true, he was believed and known to be ſo by all the reſt of the Apoſtles, and all the Chriſtians of that age; whether it were ſo or no we ſhall ſee by this Chapter. A controverſie ariſeth in the Church; well, what do they do for the reſolution of it? *Act.* 15. 1, 2. *They go up to Jeruſalem, to the Apoſtles and Elders about this queſtion.* Why did they not go to *Peter* if he were the Infallible Judg? it was a vain and frivolous thing to call them all together, if *Peter* alone might determine it. But it may be theſe were the Chriſtians at *Antioch*, and they did not well underſtand *Peters* Supremacy and Infallibility, but the Church of *Jeruſalem* underſtood it better; well, let us examine that too, in *verſ.* 6. *the Apoſtles and Elders came together to conſider of this matter*; Saint *Peter* was no more conſulted with than the reſt: in the 7. verſ. *Peter* ſpake in the Aſſembly, and delivers his opinion, *verſ.* 10. *Now therefore, why*

tempt

tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the Diſciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? the yoke of the Ceremonial Law is wholly to be taken off from the necks of Chriſtians, and no burden ſhould be laid upon them. After him *James* comes and delivers another opinion, different from *Peters*, verſ. 19,20. *My ſentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God, but that we write unto them, that they abſtain from pollutions of Idols, and from fornication, and from things ſtrangled, and from blood*; as if he had ſaid, I am not altogether of *Peters* mind, I would not have all theſe things wholly and on a ſudden diſcharged. It is but meet that ſome reſpect and tenderneſs ſhould be ſhewn to the believing *Jews*, and that we ſhould become all things to all men that we may ſave ſome; and therefore it is fit we ſhould a little comply with the *Jews*, not to impoſe Circumciſion, but *to abſtain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things ſtrangled, and from blood.* And the manner of his expreſſion here is very obſervable; My *ſentence is*, Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, *Wherefore I thus determine and conclude.* He doth not ſay, according to the preſent ſtile of the *Romaniſts*, and as he ought to have done, if their Doctrine were true, *I do in all humility preſent my opinion to the Vicar of Chriſt, the Prince of the Apoſtles, the Supream and Infallible Judg of this and all other Controverſies, to whom I freely and fully ſubmit my thoughts and judgment*; but barely relates part of *Peters* diſcourſe, and then concludes with a kind of definitive ſentence. And which is further conſiderable, this great Council prefers *James* his opinion before *Peters*, and the Decree runs in *James* his words, *verſ.* 29. *That ye abſtain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things ſtrangled, and from fornication, from which if ye keep your ſelves, ye ſhall do well.* Can any man in his right ſenſes imagine that things would have been thus managed if *Peter* had been the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Controverſies? Yet further, the Decree runs not in *Peters* name as now it doth in the Popes name, but in all their names; *Verſ.* 23. *The Apoſtles and Elders, and Brethren, ſend greeting unto the Brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia*; and *verſ.* 28. *it ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burthen than theſe neceſſary things*; and *Act.* 16. 4. *They delivered them the Decrees for to keep, that were ordained by the Apoſtles and Elders that were at Jeruſalem.* It is ridiculous and incredible to think that there ſhould not in all this ſtory be one word of *Peters* preheminence, if he were at that time what they vainly pretend him to be, the Supream Head of the whole Church, and the Infallible Judg of all Controverſies.

Another place of Scripture no leſs evident is the ſecond Chapter of Saint *Pauls* Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, where there are divers remarkable paſſages; *verſ.* 7. *The Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was committed to me* (ſaith St. *Paul*) *as the Goſpel of the Circumciſion was committed to Peter.* How? what ſtrange news is this? I thought all the Goſpel of Chriſt, whether

whether Circumciſion or Uncircumciſion had been committed to *Peter*, and not any to *Paul*, but in ſubordination to *Peter*, ſo ſays the Pope, ſo ſay the Papiſts at this day: Circumciſion and Uncircumciſion, Jews and Gentiles, all committed to *Peter*; this is a new diſcovery! Saint *Paul* though rapt up into the Third Heaven, he knew nothing of this: Peradventure whileſt he was in Heaven, the decree for *Peters* Supremacy and Infallibility was enacted upon earth, and ſo he loſt the knowledg of that Myſtery. Howſoever he found nothing of it in Heaven, and we can find nothing of it upon Earth, and therefore it muſt needs come from a third place, and what that is, I leave to you to judg. He adds further, *verſ. 9. When James, Cephas, and John, who ſeemed to be pillars* (he ſpeaks of them all alike, all Rocks and Pillars) *perceived the grace which was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowſhip*; and *verſ. 11. When Peter came to Antioch, I withſtood him to the face, becauſe he was to be blamed.* What? the Infallible Judg to be blamed? this is nonſence: the Infallible Judg to ſeduce and miſlead them that followed him? This he did, ſays Saint *Paul:* And therefore it is a very nonſenſical opinion to think that at this time he owned *Peter* to be the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Controverſies. Obſerve further, how ſleightly he ſpeaks of all the Apoſtles, and that promiſcuouſly, without any reſervation for *Peter*, verſ. *6. Thoſe who ſeemed to be ſomewhat, whatſoever they were it maketh no matter to me (God accepteth no mans perſon) for they, who ſeemed to be ſomewhat in conference added nothing to me: Peter* is no more to me than another man, nor than *James*, nor *John*, and all the Apoſtles. I received the Goſpel immediately from Chriſt, and *He that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apoſtleſhip of the Circumciſion, the ſame was mighty in me towards the Gentiles, verſ.* 8. Can any man living think, that conſiders what he believes, that the Apoſtle would have ſpoke thus, and that all the Apoſtles would have dealt thus, if they had known and believed, that *Peter* had been at this inſtant the Supream Infallible Judg, to whom all were obliged to ſubmit. But further, if all that is ſaid concerning *Peter* had been true, and if the alledged Promiſes did indeed belong to *Peter*, and did make him an Infallible Judg of all Controverſies; yet what is this to the Pope, who is a perſon of a quite different character? Which that you may underſtand a little, I ſhall in brief preſent to you the quality of thoſe perſons, who they ſay, are Infallible Judges of all Controverſies. I ſhall not mention a word out of any Proteſtant Author, but out of their own writings. The Popes Library-keeper, *Platina*, confeſſeth concerning divers of the Popes, as is notorious, that *they were, hominum portenta, monſters of men*; and elſewhere he confeſſeth, that *there were Eighteen Popes ſucceſſively, one after another that were Magicians, and in covenant with the Devil.* Can any man living think that ſuch perſons were infallibly guided by the Spirit of God that had made a league with the Devil?

and *Genebrard*, a violent and virulent Papiſt, confeſſeth that *the Popes for a hundred and fifty years together after the Apoſtles were Apoſtates, not Apoſtolical*; and our country-man *Stapleton*, an eminent man amongſt the Papiſts, ſaith, *I muſt acknowledg, I think there were ſcarce any ſins, except that of Hereſy, of which the Popes and Biſhops of* Rome *were not guilty.* And it is notoriouſly known that many of them were Adulterers, and many of them *Sodomites*, and many of them bloody and cruel men, and guilty of all ſorts of Wickedneſs. I need ſay no more, but ſhall leave it to you to judg how incredible a thing it is, that perſons of ſuch a character as this, ſhould be the Supreme and Infallible Judges of all Controverſies. How can it be imagined, that ſuch a perſon ſhould be the foundation of the Church, that is not ſo much as a true member of the Church? Or how can that Promiſe; *The gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt thee*, belong to that man that hath made a covenant with Hell it ſelf, or that is a bondſlave of the Devil? How can any infamous wicked wretch make claim to thoſe Promiſes which Chriſt made to the holy and bleſſed Apoſtles? How can it be imagined that that mans Faith is ſecured, all whoſe other Graces are ruined and come to nothing? You ſhall find that Faith and a good Conſcience go together; 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. *Holding faith and a good conſcience, which ſome having put away, concerning faith have make ſhipwrack.* How can any mans Faith live, when all his other Graces are confeſſed to be dead? And you know what Saint *James* ſaith, *Chap.* 2. *verſ.* 20. *Faith without works is dead.* How can that man pretend to be infallibly guided by the Spirit of God, that hath not the Spirit of God in him? It is expreſly ſaid of ſuch ſenſual and brutiſh men, as many of the Popes are acknowledged to have been, that they have not the Spirit of God. We have it under the hand of one of the Apoſtles, *Jude verſ.* 19. *Senſual, not having the ſpirit.* Which alſo appears (and it is very remarkable that it doth ſo) from that very Text which they bring to prove the Infallibility of Councils; *John* 14. 16, 17. *I will pray the father, and he ſhall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the ſpirit of truth whom the world* (that is, as is evident, the wicked men of the World) *cannot receive, becauſe it ſeeth him not, neither knoweth him:* the World hath not the Spirit of God, becauſe they have not ſeen nor known God. Now, who thoſe men are that have not ſeen nor known God, you may learn from another place; 1 *John* 3. 6. *Whoſoever abideth in him*, that is, in God, or in Chriſt, *ſinneth not, whoſoever ſinneth hath not ſeen him, neither known him*; that is, whoſoever doth ſell himſelf to ſin, whoſoever alloweth himſelf in the cuſtomary practice of ſin, for of ſuch only that phraſe is meant, otherwiſe the ſame Apoſtle ſays, *If we ſay we have no ſin, we deceive our ſelves, and the truth is not in us*, and *There is not a juſt man on earth that doth good and ſinneth not, Eccleſ.* 7. 20. But the meaning is, he that lives in a conſtant courſe of ſin, this man hath not ſeen God, nor known

known him, and therefore hath not the Spirit of God; and therefore away with that impudent Doctrine that pretends the infallible Guidance of the Spirit, to him that hath not ſo much as the common Graces of the Spirit of God.

By this time I hope it ſufficiently appeareth that the Doctrine of the Popes Supreme and Infallible Authority hath no foundation in Scripture; I ſhould now proceed to ſhew that this Doctrine was not owned by the Ancient Church ſucceeding the Apoſtles: But becauſe this would of it ſelf require a large diſcourſe, and hath been abundantly demonſtrated by others, and I have elſewhere ſpoken ſomething to it, I ſhall at preſent wholly forbear it. I thought to ſhew you that as it was not owned by the Scripture, ſo neither was it owned by the firſt and pureſt Churches.

For the ſecond Particular, the Supremacy and Infallibility of Councils, ſeparate from the Pope, it is ſo little owned by our Engliſh Papiſts, that I ſhall not need to ſpend many words about it. The places of Scripture which they alledg for it, are principally theſe three.

The firſt, *Matt.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.* A moſt ridiculous proof! for all that this Text proves, is the ſpecial and gracious Preſence of Chriſt: Chriſts gracious Preſence is one thing, infallible Guidance is another thing; if that Preſence of Chriſts makes all theſe infallible which have it, it is not only the Pope, or a General Council, but all Councils, and all aſſemblies of Chriſtians are Infallible. Further this Promiſe is ſuſpended upon that condition of being gathered together in Chriſts name, that is, by Chriſts command and commiſſion, ſeeking his honour and glory, being guided by his Rule, and acting according to his Will; all which is included in that phraſe of being *gathered in Chriſts name:* It is true he that doth all this is Infallible, but the queſtion is, whether they do this; nay, it is abundantly evident they do it not.

Another place is, *John* 16. 13. *When the ſpirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.* To that I ſhall need only to ſay this, that this Promiſe is made to the Apoſtles alone, and it is made to every Apoſtle. Pray obſerve it, it was not only made to *Peter*, but to all the Apoſtles, and to every Apoſtle: whereas one Apoſtle went one way, and another another way, one preached to the Jews, another to the Gentiles, God did promiſe that he would direct all theſe in Preaching the Doctrine of the Goſpel, that they ſhould be led into all neceſſary truths, and this was neceſſary to be done in laying the foundation of the Chriſtian Church: But what is this to the Pope or General Council? He doth not ſay, that the Apoſtles ſhall be Infallible only when they are gathered together, but every one aſunder: otherwiſe all thoſe Churches which were converted by the Preaching of any ſingle Apoſtle (which was the caſe of moſt Churches in the World) had no certain

and infallible foundation for their Faith. And consequently, if this Priviledg be extended to the Successors of the Apostles, then not only the Pope is Infallible, but all and every other Successor of any one of the Apostles is Infallible; so that either it proves the Infallibility of divers particular persons, or else it doth not prove the Infallibility of Councils. Another place is, *Act.* 15. 28. *For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay no other burthen upon you.* A most impertinent Allegation; this is only a Declaration of the present case, and no Promise for the future. It is true, he says, this Council was guided by the Holy Ghost, and so they were, but does not say all other Councils shall. It is notoriously known that many Councils there were that were *Arrians*, and others that were Erroneous in other points; and the Papists themselves confess that many Councils have Erred, especially those Councils that have undertaken to censure and condemn the Popes, and to set up their own Authority above them. These, they say, were not led by the Holy Ghost, but (as they say expresly of the famous Council of *Carthage* for that very reason) acted by the instigation of the Devil. So that it seems all General Councils are not Infallible, but such as they please, or such as please them; the rest must seek their fortunes, and shift for themselves. As for this Council, *Act.* 15. it is confessed they were Infallible. But doth it therefore follow, that because this Council all the Members whereof were holy men, and divers of them holy Apostles, (every one of which was Infallible) were Infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost in this Controversie, that therefore a General Council, consisting sometimes (for ought appears to the contrary) wholly of wicked men without the Spirit of God, should be Infallibly guided in all Controversies? There is no man of common sense but sees an evident disparity in the case.

I know there is one thing they further pretend, that though it be true, the Pope is not Infallible of himself, nor the Council alone, yet both together are Infallible; The Decrees of the Pope confirmed by a General Council are Infallible. Two things only I shall say to this.

1. This is but a shuffling evasion against their own Consciences, because it is notoriously known, and the Popish Doctors unanimously confess it, that this supposed Infallibility is lodged either in the Pope, or in the Council; They will not allow of a mixt Infallibility, that the Pope should constitute one part, and the Council another. *Bellarmine* says, that *Infallibility does not lye partly in the Pope, and partly in the Council, but it is wholly in the Pope, and in the Council, so far and no further than they cleave to the Pope*; and says another, *Stapl. The Council adds no Infallibility to the Pope; it is he alone that is Infallible.* And on the other side, those that place the Infallibility in the Council do as expresly affirm, *It is not partly in the Pope, and partly in the Council, but wholly in the Council, and in the Pope no further than he sticks to the Council.* Which having fully proved elsewhere out of their own Authors, I shall here omit. By which

which it is evident enough, that this is only an artifice to deceive the ignorant and injudicious people, but is not satisfactory to their own Consciences.

2. If this were true, it would do them no good, because it doth not reach the present state of the Church; for at this time there is no General Council in the Church; the Pope is now the only Head of the Church amongst them; so that either the Pope alone is the Infallible Judg, or there is none at this day. If it be said, they have besides the Popes Authority, the Decrees and Writings of the Councils, that will do them no good; for they all say, there is a necessity of a living Infallible Judg, and they say of the Scripture, that it is but a dead letter, and that no Writings can determine Controversies: so that there being now no Head of the Church beside the Pope, either he is Infallible or there is none such in their Church at this day; and therefore I may conclude, that no particular person or company of men now is, or can be, the Supream Judg of the Church, to whom all Christians are bound to submit their Faith and Consciences. I shall conclude all with two practical Inferences.

1. Learn from hence what infinite cause you have to bless God that hath delivered and preserved you from Popery, and what need you have continually to pray, and to use all lawful endeavours that this Iron-yoke may never be put upon you. The Popish teachers do by their people, as the *Philistims* did by *Sampson*, put out their eyes, and make them grind in their mill. Papists must see by their Teachers eyes, and are obliged to believe whatever they teach them. I have been informed by an *English* Merchant, sometimes residing in *Spain*, that being in some Conference concerning Religion, with a *Spaniard* of note there and his intimate Acquaintance, he used these Expressions with Tears in his Eyes; "You People of *England* are happy, you have liberty to see "with your own eyes, and to examine the Doctrine delivered to you, "upon which your everlasting life depends; but says he, We dare not "say, our Souls are our own, but we are bound to believe whatever our "Teachers tell us, though it be never so unreasonable or ridiculous. It is doubtless a dreadful thing for a man to see the Inquisition on the one hand, and damnation on the other hand. Therefore let us bless God that hitherto hath delivered us, and hath prevented in some good measure the hopes and expectations of Papists. Understand I beseech you, and consider your Privilege; We Ministers do not impose upon you, and tell you, you must believe all we say, though it would be for our interest to do so; but we say with the Apostle, *We speak unto wise men, judg ye what we say*; We commend you as St. *Paul* did the *Bereans*, *Act.* 17. for searching the Scriptures, whether these Doctrines we teach be true or no. It is a great evidence of the truth of the Protestant Doctrine, that it is not afraid of the Light, it desires nothing more than to be tried; and it is no less an evidence of the falshood of Popery, that they

they dread nothing more than the Light. You know what our Saviour ſays, *Joh.* 3. 20, 21. *Every one that doth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, leſt his deeds ſhould be reproved, but he that doth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifeſt, that they are wrought in God.* God hath given you Talents, we command you to uſe your Talents, they command you to wrap them in a napkin. God hath given you light, *The Spirit of a man is the Candle of the Lord*; we command you to ſee by that Light, they command you to hide it under a buſhel. Pity blind Papiſts, pray for them, and rejoyce in the goodneſs of God towards you, and ſee what cauſe you have to be fervent in prayer, that God may never ſuffer Popery to recover its ſtanding in theſe Kingdoms.

2. For as much as there is no perſon upon Earth that can infallibly guide you to Salvation, it concerns you to have the greater care of your own Salvation. You will ſay what ſhall we do? I ſhall only give you theſe three Directions, and ſo conclude. Do but theſe three things, and you need not be troubled that you have no Infallible Judg to ſecure you in your way.

1. Study the holy Scriptures, let the Pope forbid you to do it, it is no matter, it is ſufficient for us, that Chriſt commands you to do it, *Joh.* 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life*; *ye think*, and ye think right, you muſt not take that for a term of diminution; no more than when the Apoſtle ſaith, *I think I have the ſpirit of God*, 1 Cor. 7. But the meaning is, you judg, and you judg aright in it; *Joh.* 20. 31. *Theſe things are written that you might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.* The Word is written, and bleſſed be God you have it before your eyes, it is not hid nor locked up from you, as amongſt the miſerable Papiſts; but the Book is open, and you may read it, and may by Gods bleſſing upon your own induſtry and the uſe of thoſe helps which his gracious Providence affords you, in competent meaſure underſtand it. I ſhall only mention that one place, and methinks the very reading of it ſhould put this diſpute quite out of doors, 2 *Tim.* 3. 14, *&c. But continue thou in the things which thou haſt learned, and haſt been aſſured of, knowing of whom thou haſt learned them, and that from a child thou haſt known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wiſe unto Salvation, through Faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus.*

2. Pray fervently for the Guidance of Gods Spirit; and for your encouragement know that God hath not left you without Promiſes, & thoſe much more clear than thoſe which the Papiſts produce for their *Diana* of Infallibility. In general this, *Joh.* 16. 23. *Whatſoever ye ſhall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.* And leſt any ſhould think this Promiſe is confined to the Apoſtles, our Saviour adds, *Joh.* 17. 20, 21. *Neither pray I for theſe alone, but for them alſo which ſhall believe on me through their word. That they all may be one, &c.* Another clear and comfortable

ſortable Promiſe to this purpoſe you have *Luk.* 11. 13. *If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your Children, how much more ſhall your Heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to thoſe that ask him?* Whence I may venture to draw this Concluſion, That an holy and humble Chriſtian ſincerely asking the conduct of the holy Spirit, hath better aſſurance of his Infallible Guidance in all Truths neceſſary to Salvation, than an ungodly Pope that either doth not ask it, or asks amiſs, ſeeing ſuch a perſon hath no intereſt in Chriſt, *in whom* alone *all the Promiſes are Yea and Amen*, 2 Cor. 1. 20. And therefore let no Chriſtian perplex himſelf with ſuch anxious thoughts as theſe, What ſhall I do under the various and contradictory Opinions that are amongſt us? I want wiſdom to diſcern. St. *James* tells you what you ſhould do, *Jam.* 1. 5. *If any man lack wiſdom, let him ask of God, who gives to all men* (mark that) *liberally, and upbraideth not, and it ſhall be given him.* And therefore in this caſe beg Counſel from God. There is not the weakeſt, nor the moſt ignorant creature amongſt you, but if you faithfully and diligently ſeek direction from God, you may confidently expect it. Pray to God as *David* did, *Pſal.* 25. 5. *Lead me in thy Truth, and teach me; for thou art the God of my Salvation, on thee do I wait all the day.* And *Pſal.* 43. 3. *Oh ſend out thy Light and thy Truth, let them lead me, and bring me unto thy holy hill.* And as *David* did beg this of God, ſo he promiſeth it to himſelf, and ſo may every ſincere Chriſtian, *Pſal.* 73. 24. *Thou ſhalt guide me with thy counſel, and afterwards receive me to glory.* God is the ſame God ſtill, and as able and as willing to direct you as ever he was, and as faithful in keeping his Promiſe as ever, as ready to hear as you are willing to ask. You have it under Gods hand, *Luk.* 11. 10. *Ask and you ſhall receive, ſeek and you ſhall find, knock and it ſhall be opened to you.* What need more be ſaid to encourage the Faith and the Hope of all that fear God?

3. If you would diſcern and hold faſt the Truth, love and practiſe it. The beſt way to be certainly guided into the way of Truth, is to live up to it. Of this we have evident aſſurance in that forementioned place, *Joh.* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I ſpeak of my ſelf.* Certainly a good Conſcience is the beſt preſervative of a mans Faith; and therefore when once men put away a good Conſcience, the next news is, they make ſhipwrack of their Faith, 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. *Holding faith and a good conſcience, which ſome having put away, concerning faith have made ſhipwrack:* an eminent inſtance you have, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 10, 11, 12. *Becauſe they received not the love of the truth that they might be ſaved, for this cauſe God ſhall ſend them ſtrong deluſions, that they ſhould believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the Truth, but had pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs.* A Text that needs no other Comment but the Examples of this Generation. Papiſts brag much of the many Proſelytes they have gained amongſt us. For my part I am not at all ſurprized with it. When I conſider

ſider ſuch Texts as this and the righteous and tremendous Judgments of God, I rather wonder they do not flow in to them in far greater numbers. Nor can I believe that any wiſe man will think they have any great cauſe of triumph in their Proſelytes, if he will but make a little enquiry, and get a true Character of the generality of them. He that knows their Morals will never wonder at the change of their Religion. It is no ſtrange thing if a diſſolute Proteſtant turn a zealous Papiſt; or if the righteous God ſhake thoſe out of his lap, and out of the Proteſtant Church who were but rotten members of it.

I conclude all with that excellent advice, 2 *Pet.* 3. 17, 18. *Ye therefore, beloved, ſeeing ye know theſe things before, beware leſt ye alſo being led away by the error of the wicked, fall from your own ſtedfaſtneſs, but grow in Grace, and in the knowledg of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*

CHRIST

SERMON II.

CHRIST, and not the POPE, Universal Head of the Church.

1 Cor. 12. 27, 28. *Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.*
And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, &c.

OUR appointed Work at this time is to determine, *Whether there be such a Church of Christs Institution, as consisteth of all Christians United or Subjected to any one meer humane Head, Personal or Collective?* Or, *Whether there be any Universal Head or Governour of the whole Church on Earth, besides, and under Jesus Christ?* Which I deny. And when I have fully opened the question, I shall prove the Negative both from this Text, and several other Texts and Arguments.

Of all the Controversies between us and the Papists, this is the first and greatest: We first deny that there is any such Head: And secondly, That the Pope is such a Head.

The Papists, as knowing the impossibility of finding any fair pretence of ascribing the Internal acts of Christs Office to the Pope, are forced to distinguish, a Mediatorial Head of vital influx to the Church-Regenerate, from a *Political Governing Head* of the Church-*visible* (or Congregate). And they confess that Christ only is the first; but say, that under Christ, the Pope is, as his Vicegerent, the second: But we maintain the Negative as to both: And if there be no such Head, there is no Church that is so Headed. Two things in this word are meant in our denial. First, There is no such *Constitutive Head*, who is to the Universal Church a Constitutive, Essential part; as is a King in a Kingdom, a Master in a Family, and the *Pars Imperans*, in every Political Society. Secondly, There is no such *Governing Head*, having *Power* and *Obligation* to make Universal Laws, and to Judg and Execute Universally.

There are three ways of Divine Institution which we here exclude. First, God hath instituted no such Head or Church by the Law of Nature. Secondly, Nor by Christ himself, immediately determining it in his

humane Nature on earth. Thirdly, Nor by the Revelation or determination of his Spirit in his Apostles or any other Authorized and Infallible Inspired persons: And besides these three, we know no other sort of Institution of God, to come into question.

Our question medleth not with the Heads or Governours of Kingdoms, nor of particular Churches; but only of the Universal Church.

Arg. 1. From Nature, common Reason and Experience, *a non posse, ad non esse:* No mortal man, or Collective body of men, is capable of being a Constitutive and Governing-Head of all the Church on Earth: Therefore there is no such Head.

First, No single person is capable of it. To prove which, consider but, 1. *What a Man is.* 2. What such a man would have to do.

First, A Man is a poor finite creature, confined to one place at once, not able to compass the Earth, nor know all its Countreys, much less Inhabitants: Not able to take notice of all the actions of the sons of men throughout the World; nor to receive such satisfactory information concerning them, as may inable him to judg them justly: Nor is he capable of taking cognisance of one of many Millions of Causes that would belong to such a Judg. And Man is a poor Worm, unable to procure any due execution of Universal Laws, and to repress the Rebellion of Resisters; and to defend the Church against its enemies. And man is so bad a creature, that he that is tried in so great a work as the Government of all the World, and tried by so great temptations as must needs arise in such an undertaking, will but become (according to the course of ordinary changes) the worst, and so the most odious of men: So that it is a wonder that Man should become so ignorant, as to think that any one mortal Man is capable of Ruling all the World, or all the Christians in the World.

Secondly, But consider what such a Head must have to do, and there will remain no difficulty in the Case. 1. He that undertaketh the Universal Government, undertaketh to make Universal Laws, and to exercise Supream Power in Judging and Executing according to those Laws. And he that maketh Universal Laws in things unchangeable, must suppose that Christ hath not done it himself already, which is false: And in things changeable, he must be sufficiently acquainted with the state of all the Nations in the World, and the different Cases which require diversification both as to Time and Place: which a Man of many Thousand miles distance is uncapable of.

And as to Judgment and Execution. 1. As to Persons, it is to be exercised upon individuals. 2. As to Causes; it is 1. Either Judging who is fit or unfit for the Sacred Ministry, as to Ordination; or 2. Who is fit or unfit for Christian Communion. And that in respect, 1. To Knowledg and Faith, or Ignorance, Unbelief or Heresie; Or 2. To a Pious and Honest, or a Criminal Conversation.

First,

First, Kingdoms or Cities are not either to be taken into, or cast out of that Church of Christ, for the *Faith* or the *Faults* of any part of them. Baptism belongeth to Individuals; and to Cities and Kingdoms no otherwise than as consisting of such Individuals: It is the Faithful and their Seed that are to be baptized; God never Authorized any to baptize Kingdoms or Cities because the King or Magistrates believed.

And the same must be said of Excommunications; Kingdoms or Cities are not to be Unchurched, or Interdicted Gods worship, because of the sin of Kings and Magistrates: (Though such inhumane and unchristian kind of Discipline hath (upon the *Venetians* and many other Countries) been exercised by the Pope); God saith, that the Soul that sinneth shall dye, and not the Son for the Fathers sin, which he is not guilty of.

Secondly, And if this be so, it is easie to discern whether one Man can so Govern all the World. 1. He that ordaineth Ministers, must try them, that he may truly judg of their sufficiency. 2. He that baptizeth the Adult, must try their Knowledg and Faith, that he may truly judg of their Capacity. 3. He that will justly judg any accused of Heresie or wicked living, must hear the Witnesses, and hear the Person, and understand the circumstances of the Cause: And before he Excommunicate any, he must not only know him to be Criminal, but also Impenitent; and therefore must with Evidence, Love and Patience, endeavour first to bring him to Repentance. The like knowledg is necessary to a just Absolution. And what can one Man do in any of this, for all the World?

Object. *He can do it* per alios, *though not* per se: *He can send forth men to do it. The King cannot Govern his Kingdom by himself only, without Officers; but by them he can.*

Answ. 1. What other men do, he doth not: To say he doth it *per alios*, is but a deceitful phrase, and maketh not their work to be his. That which he doth, is not to Preach, and Baptize, and Excommunicate, and Absolve *by them*, but to bid them do it, or license them; yet if he sent them all to do it as his Servants Authorized by him to do it in his name and stead, it might be called morally his Act: but it is not so. The Office of a Bishop or Presbyter, is of Divine Institution, and their work described by the Word of God; and the Office and Work is their own; and they themselves are accountable for it to their chief Pastor, Jesus Christ. 2. The work of an Ecclesiastick Pastor is personal, even the exercise of his own skill, and not only the commanding of another to do it. If setting others on the work were all that's necessary, there needed no Bishop or Pastor to be such a Head; a Prince were fitter: *David* and *Solomon* could command the Priests and

Levites to do their Office, and could place and displace them; and so many Christian Kings: But as it is not the proper Office of a Physician, Surgeon, Printer, Architect, &c. to License Physicians, Surgeons, Printers, &c. or to set them on work; so neither of a Bishop or Pastor to license or command such: And for Ordination, it may be done without a Pope; or else how is the Pope ordained or consecrated himself. 3. The Office of the Apostles was not only to send other men to convert the World, and settle the Churches, and govern them; but first to labour in all this themselves, and then to ordain others to go along with them as their helpers, and to govern the particular Churches; which is not the same thing, as only to set other men on work. 4. A Kings Office consisteth so much in Power, to appoint Officers under him to their several Provinces and Works, as that therein it greatly differeth from a Pastors, which is like to a Physicians, or a Philosophers, and more consisteth in the exercise of personal skill and oversight. 5. But if all this hitherto said were nothing, it is most certain that no King is capable of governing all the World: And if the Pastoral Office required no more personal skill and exercise thereof than the Regal; yet all that would follow were but this, that as a King by himself and his Officers, can govern a Kingdom, but not all the World, so is it to be said of any Pastor; though indeed the latter is much less possible.

The Impossibilities are notorious at this day. 1. The Pope doth not so much as know a very great part of the World, what Inhabitants it hath, or of what Religion. 2. Much of the World is so remote from him that his Messengers must be many years in going, and all informations as long in being sent to him. 3. The passage is so hazardous and difficult that they are not likely by Sea and Land to escape all the dangers in the way. 4. Many Princes Countries must be past through that are enemies to Christians, and in frequent Wars with us, and one another, and therefore will not suffer such passage and intercourse as the Government of the remotest parts require. 5. There are many Countries that understand no Language which the Popes Emissaries can speak. 6. There are many Christian Countries at this day which the Pope lately was not known to, nor ever so much as required their Subjection to him, by reason of their incapacity of Converse. When *Oviedo* would have made the *Abassins* believe that Subjection to the Pope was necessary to their Salvation, the Emperours Mother posed him by that Question, *Why God nor the Pope ever told them so till now, and why they never before heard of the Popes claim?* To which the poor man had no better an answer to give, Than that inaccessibleness and distance hindered it, as *Godignus* himself reciteth the Discourse. Which is no less than a plain confession of what I am proving, that no one man is capable of governing all the World: When so great an Empire as that of *Abassia* (especially in its former grandeur) was so far out of the

Papal

Papal reach, as that for so many hundred years he could never so much as know them, and send a Governour to them, nor any Messengers to claim their Obedience; no wonder if much more of the World be further out of the reach of his Notice and Jurisdiction.

Arg. 1. And as no single natural Person, so much more no *Collective Person* or Company is capable to be an Universal Governour. For all the foresaid difficulties will be yet greater to them, than to one. There is none but an Universal Council that can be supposed to make such a Claim; which Council must be *one Civil Person*, or Collective, and therefore be in one place, and manage this Government by Consent: But 1. That place where they meet will be as distant from the Antipodes as *Rome* is, and they will have as far to send and receive information. 2. The collecting of a true Universal Council, as I shall shew anon, is not only difficult, but never to be done. 3. One man may do more in a day, than a Parliament, much more a Council of all the Christian World, can do in many Days or Weeks; there are so many to speak, debate, and to receive satisfaction. 4. And feuds and disagreements will be yet a greater hinderance: So that where there is a Natural Incapacity, there can be no Universal Governour; But both Pope and Council have a Natural Incapacity: Therefore neither of them can be an Universal Governour.

Arg. 2. From the silence of the Creed and Scripture concerning such an Universal Head: If Christ had instituted any Vicarious, Universal Governour, and consequently a Church so constituted, it would have been plainly revealed in the Creed, or Sacred Scriptures: But there is no such thing plainly revealed (nor darkly neither) in the Creed or Sacred Scriptures. Therefore there was no such instituted by Christ.

The Major is proved, in that they commonly confess that all Fundamentals or points of common necessity are plainly revealed in the Creed, or Sacred Scriptures; and they assert that an Universal Governour, and a Church so constituted, is a Fundamental, and a point of common necessity to be believed: Therefore if Christ had instituted any such, it must needs have been in the Creed, or Scriptures. No man can imagine that if the rest of the matters of Divine Faith must themselves be received from the believed Authority of such a Head or Church, Christ would not plainly make known the Authority of such a Head and Church: But this is the foundation of the Papists Faith.

And that there is no such thing contained in the Creed or Sacred Scriptures, the Impartial reading of them is enough to prove: The Creed mentioneth the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church as one; but saith not a word of *Rome*, or the Pope, or a Council, or any Universal Governour of this Church, besides Jesus Christ.

The Sacred Scriptures mention no such neither; it is only *Peter* that is pretended by the Papists to be there endued with such a Power. But 1. There is no word that speaks such a thing; the confutation of their vain

vain Collections, from *Tues Petrus, &c.* and *Pasce oves meas, &c.* I have made elsewhere, and in this short Exercitation neither need nor may recite it.

2. It belongeth to the Universal Governour to make Universal Laws for the Church; but no Scripture tells us of any more that *Peter* did in this Legislation, than *James* or *Paul*, or other Apostles.

3. It belongeth to the Universal Governour to give Authority to all the rest, and to settle all Inferiour Orders and Officers; but no Scripture mentioneth any such thing of *Peter*, but the contrary, *viz.* Deacons were instituted by the Apostles jointly; none of the rest of the Twelve received his Power from *Peter*; *Paul* took *Silas*, and *Barnabas* took *Mark* with him, and *Paul* made *Timothy*, *Titus*, and others Evangelists without *Peter*, or any Authority received from him; and the Apostles ordained Elders in every Church which they planted without *Peter*, *Act.* 14.23. *Tit.* 1.5, *&c.*

Obj. *They had their power from Christ before he ascended, and so needed not receive it from Peter.*

Ans. Either *Peter* was made the Universal Governour before Christs Ascension or not; if not, then Christ personally setled no such Monarchy; yea, then he setled contrarily an Aristocracy, or equality of Power in many, that is, in all the Apostles; and is it credible that he setled one form of Government at first, and changed it so quickly after? And then the Churches were after Christs Ascension planted and setled by such as had no Power from *Peter*, and so the Succession is not from him as the Head. And then all the Texts pretended by them (as *Pasce oves, &c.*) are by them forsaken. But if *Peter* was made Monarch before Christs Ascension then the other Apostles must before be under Christ and him, and as the Church had two Heads at once, a Prime and a Vicarious, so the rest must have their Power from both. At least after Christs Ascension all the Apostles would fall under the Government of *Peter*, and so from thence must hold their Power from him, which they never did.

4. It belongeth to the Universal Governour to be the known declared Center of the Churches common Unity; to whom accordingly in case of Divisions they should have recourse throughout all the World. But it was not so concerning *Peter*; We read of many sad Contentions, in the Churches of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Colosse*, *&c.* yea of *Rome* it self, *Rom.* 14. *&* 15. and many sad Heresies, Crimes and Breaches in the Seven *Asian* Churches, *Rev.* 2. *&* 3. and yet not a word to refer them to *Peter* for their healing, nor one reproof for their rebellion against him as Universal Governour, nor one perswasion to unite all in him! Nay he himself, who 2 *Pet.* 2. doth write sharply against Heresies, never mentioneth any such remedy.

5. And

5. And it belongeth to the Universal Head and Governour to rebuke all culpable Inferiours, and to receive appeals in cases of difficulty. But none of all this is said of *Peter*, but contrarily that *Paul* withstood him to the face, because he walked not uprightly, and was to be blamed, *Gal.* 2. so that the case in Scripture is plain against them.

Arg. 3. From the contrary Assertions in the Holy Scriptures. The Scriptures are not only silent as to the Institution of any such Universal Governour or Church, but they speak against it: Therefore there was no such Institution of Christ.

And here I must come up to my Text, and from it and others bring in several Scripture-Arguments.

Note here 1. That the Unity of the Church, and the nature and reasons of it, are most largely and expresly handled in this Chapter. 2. That this Church is called the Body of Christ, but not of *Peter* or the Pope; and that its Unity is placed in *one Spirit*, *one Lord*, and *one God*, *Vers.* 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13. and not in one Vicarious Head. 3. That all Believers are numbred with the Members, even Apostles themselves expresly, as contradistinct from the Head in whom they are united. Apostles are called here, Members in particular, set by God in the Church, even the *first* rank of *Members*, and Prophets next. If *Peter* then was the Universal Head, it was not as an Apostle; for the Apostles were but the noblest Members in particular.

Arg. I. If Christ be here described as the only Head, and Apostles but as particular Members, then no Apostle was an Universal Governour or Head: But the Antecedent is plain in the Text, *&c.*

And indeed *Bellarmine* is forced to maintain that the Pope succeedeth not *Peter* as an Apostle, but as the Vicarious Head of the Church; by which he confesseth that *Peter* was not such a Head as an Apostle. But *Paul* here describing the whole Body, mentioneth no part but Christ the Head, and Apostles and others variously gifted and placed, as particular Members. So that here is no Office above Apostolical in which the Pope can succeed *Peter*.

Arg. II. The same evidence is visible in *Ephes.* 4. where *Paul* vehemently endeavouring the *Ephesians* Unity, reckoneth up only these seven Necessaries in which it must be founded: 1. *One Body* (of Christ). 2. *One Spirit*. 3. *One Hope of our Calling* (Grace and Glory). 4. *One Lord* (Jesus Christ). 5. *One Faith* (the Belief of the Gospel). 6. *One Baptism* (and Baptismal Covenant). 7. *One God and Father of all, above all, through all and in all*), vers. 3, 4, 5, 6. And in all the Members who must in these seven be united, he placeth diversity, and numbereth Apostles, Prophets and Pastors with the rest, as being but particular Members of the Body. And then he describeth the Body that is thus to be united, the ends and benefits of their concord, and the subordinate means,

means, to *verſ.* 16. In which he calleth them the Body of Chriſt. (only and not of the Pope) which muſt come to a perfect man, in the Unity of Faith and Knowledg of Chriſt, and not be toſſed with every wind of Doctrine, but grow up in him in all things which is the Head, Chriſt: *From whom the whole body fitly conjoyned and compacted* (not by another Head but) *by that which every joynt ſupplyeth, according to the effectual working in the meaſure of every part, maketh increaſe of the body to the edifying of it ſelf in love.* There could never have been an opener door, for *Paul* to have brought in the mention of an Univerſal Vicarious Governour at, if he had known of any ſuch; than the occaſions and Subject here in hand. But here is ſtill none but Chriſt the Head, and Apoſtles and others as the particular Members.

Arg. III. Yet more expreſly in 1 *Cor.* 1. 3. When the *Corinthians* were inclined to factions; ſome would have United in *Paul*, and ſome in *Apollo*, and ſome in *Cephas* or *Peter*, and ſome would have appropriated Chriſt to themſelves. And how doth *Paul* ſeek to heal this Schiſm? Not by telling them that indeed they muſt all Unite in *Peter* as the Univerſal Head or Monarch; but that *Chriſt is not divided* (and therefore he muſt be their common Center) and that the reſt were but his Miniſters by whom they believed, and were not crucified for them, nor were they Baptized into their name; and that they ſhewed themſelves Carnal by theſe contentions, in ſetting up one above another, when *Paul*, *Apollo*, and *Cephas*, were alike theirs, and Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of his Myſteries; *Cap.* 3.3,22. & 4.1. So that here *Peter* is not only not mentioned as the Head and Center of Church-Unity, when his Name was in queſtion, and the Caſe required it, (had it been true) but alſo expreſly and by Name excluded from any ſuch Office, and thoſe ſharply taxed that would ſo have thought of him, nay, that thought yet lower of him; for indeed there is no probability that any of the *Corinthians* dreamt of his Univerſal Government, but only ſome preferred him as a more excellent Teacher before all others, in a ſiding way.

Arg. IV. When *Peter* himſelf inſtructeth the Paſtors of the Church in their duty, 1. He taketh no higher title to himſelf than an Apoſtle and Servant of Jeſus Chriſt, and an Elder, and a Witneſs of his ſufferings, and a partaker of the Glory that ſhall be revealed. 2. And he tells them that they muſt not overſee the flock as Lords, but as Examples; which is inconſiſtent with their opinion, who take his Univerſal Government, to be eſſential to the Church, and neceſſary to Salvation to be believed.

Arg. V. In *Matt.* 20. We find it put by way of petition to Chriſt, to determine who ſhould be greateſt; *viz*, that *James* and *John* might be

be next him in his Kingdom; and *Peter* with the rest of the Ten were offended at it: yet Christ is so far from telling them that either they, or *Peter* shall have such honour, that he contrarily concludeth; *vers.* 25. &c. *Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them; but it shall not be so among you: But whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.* Even in this, not telling them who shall be the Man, but leaving it to them by humility and service to merit all that preeminence which he alloweth of.

Arg. 4. The Fourth chief Argument is fetcht from the Non-consistence of such an Universal Head with the Office and Prerogative of Christ.

To have Instituted an Universal Head and Governour, would have been the making of another Christ, or at least the communicating of part of the Essence of Christs Office and Prerogative; But Christ did never make another Christ, nor communicate any part of the Essence of his Office or Prerogative: Therefore Christ did never Institute an Universal Head and Governour.

The first Proposition is proved by the true definition or description of Christs Office, which containeth his Universal Kingdom, as well as his Universal Propriety and Priesthood. That Christ is the *Owner* and the Ruler of all, is believed by all that believe him to be the Christ; *For this end, he both dyed, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and of the living, Rom.* 14. 9. And the Universality of some parts of his Priestly Office are acknowledged; and of the rest, as to those who are capable of the Benefits. He is the *Owner* of all the World: And he is the Ruler of all, *de jure, & de facto*, in divers manners and degrees, though only the faithful obey him to Salvation: And his Sacrifice had not only a sufficiency for all, but also effectually procured the common Grace and Benefits which are actually given to all. And 1. It is confessed by all sober persons, that Christ hath not given to any under him an Universal Propriety. If any Parasite of the Pope so talk, the rest dare not own it. To be the Lord or Owner of all *Things* and *Persons* is proper to Christ: If the Pope be his *Vicarious* Proprietary, Kings and Persons are at his will, and mercy, and he need not to be beholden to any Prince for Tribute; for all Lands and Monies in the World are his: But this is the proper Prerogative of Christ. And there is no Mediator that offereth himself a Sacrifice for the sins of the World, or meriteth for all men, or all believers, but Jesus Christ.

The *Minor* is undeniable: Christ by vertue of his Universal Power, hath communicated a Ministerial Limited Subordinate Power to men, over several parts of his Church or Kingdom, but not Universal over

all; which needeth no other proof, than to know that *Authority* and *Obligation* concur in constituting every such Office: And if any one Apostle had been *Obliged* to Rule, yea, or to Teach all the World, he had been obliged to an impossibility. Therefore even the Apostles all together had but an *Indefinite* obligation, and not an Universal as to all the World; no, nor to all the Churches: For if *e.g. Philip* their Deacon, or his converted Eunuch, or *Joseph*, or *Nathaniel*, or any other Preacher did convert any Countrey, or gather any Churches far off from the reach of any Apostle, no Apostle was bound to Teach or Rule that Church; much less any one of them to Teach and Rule all the World.

And 1. If Christ have not made an Universal Sub-proprietor, it's not like that he hath made an Universal Rector. 2. If Christ have not made an Universal Teacher, 3. Nor an Universal Priest; by the same Reason we may conclude, that the Universal Kingdom is incommunicable. 4. And as to the Kingdom it self, 1. The Universal Legislation is already performed by Christ, and therefore not left to Man. 2. *Universal*, Forcible Government is committed to no Man: All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to Christ; and he committeth the Sword to Kings and Magistrates, and the Word to Ministers with the Keys of the Church; But Christ never made an Universal King or Magistrate under him, to Govern all the World by the Sword: Therefore we as well may conclude, that he never made an Universal Pastor, or Church-Monarch; one part of his proper Kingdom being no more communicable than the other. 3. And Universal *Protection*, which is another kind of Kingly Office, is not communicated to any. The Pope cannot Protect all the World, or all the Church; so that all the rest of Christs Office, being as to the *Universality* confessed incommunicable, it will follow that Government must be so also: I say, As to *Universality*, as foreseeing that they will object, that it is Incommunicable as to *Primacy* of *Power*, but not as to *Universality*; which therefore I have proved, though in this strait I must not stand to Answer their frivolous Objections.

And here you may perceive, why Protestants say that the Pope is Antichrist, even because he traiterously usurpeth, and arrogateth, that which is Essential to Christs own Office, by making himself an Universal Head to Christs Body, and Governour of his Kingdom, on a false pretence of Christs delegation.

Object. *A King may make a Vice-King, or Lieutenant, without parting with any of his Royalty or Prerogatives.*

Answ. 1. It is not the *Name* of a *Viceroy*, but the Thing that is in question. A King may call a Subject his Viceroy, and may make him his chief Magistrate over some part of his Empire that is distant from him,

him, yea or over the whole: But if he give him the absolute *Legislative*, and *Judicial* Power over all his Kingdom, he parteth with his Royalty, and maketh that man King. 2. But suppose it were otherwise, the reason of the difference in the case is evident. A King is but a Man, and so is his Viceroy, and one is as capable of Ruling as the other. But Universal Government is somewhat above the capacity of any meer Man, and none but God and our Redeemer is capable of it: Therefore if Christ will make an Universal Head and Governour of the World or Church, he must make him another Christ, or a God, or else he doth not make him capable.

Arg. 5. A *negatione effectus ad negationem effectionis.* There never was such an Universal Vicarious Head of Christs Body: Therefore he never instituted such.

Nothing but the Antecedent here needs proof.

I shall consider (for the proof of the Antecedent) 1. Of the Church in the time when the Scripture was written: 2. And of the Church till the days of *Constantine*: 3. And of the Church till the Usurpation of the Title of Universal Head: 4. And of the Church since then to this day.

1. In Scripture-times I have proved already, that neither *Peter* nor any other did govern the Universal Church, in Ordination, Legislation, Judgment, Appeals, &c.

2. Till *Constantines* time there is not the least probability of any such thing in Church-History; which I will not be beholden to any man to grant me who is acquainted with the Records of Antiquity; nor do I fear a denial from any thing but Faction, or blind Partiality, such as *Baronius*, and other Flatterers of the Pope were byassed by. For whereas the chief Claim of the Pope is from his Presidency in Councils, till *Constantines* days there never was such a thing as a General Council in the World (unless you will call Christs Family and Apostles such). And he that can prove the Pope to have been till then the Governour of all the World, or all the Christians in the World, will fetch his proofs (neither from Scripture nor true History, but) from somewhat unknown to other Mortals.

3. And were Men but Impartial in the studying of Church-History, I would not be beholden to any Man readily to acknowledg all that follows: 1. That *Constantine* and his Successors were far from being Rulers of all the World, having but one Empire, which though great, the Maps will tell you was small in comparison of all the Earth. 2. That the Bishop of *Rome* was to the Empire but as the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* is to *England*; a Bishop who by that Emperour had a Primacy given him in his Empire: For what Power had he to settle a Head to the rest of the World? 3. That whereas his Presidency in General Councils was his chief pretence for his Universal Power, even that Presidency was unconstant, and varied as the Emperour pleased. 4. That

those General Councils were called General but in reference to one Principality or Empire, (as the *Scots* called their Assemblies *General*) and were no Universal Councils representing all the Churches in the World. For 1. They were called long by the Emperour; And what Power had the *Roman* Emperour to call together the Bishops of all the World? 2. The Subscriptions of the Bishops as recorded even in *Binius*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, *Crab*, will satisfie any man that doth not by Faction hinder his own satisfaction: And though the name of one *Johannes Perfidis* in the Council of *Nice*, and some such Instances in others, seem great Objections to some Men, I let them go, as knowing that there is no end of disputing with those Men that can make a Mountain of an Atome. There was a City called *Persis*; and it was then usual to place a Bishop at the Borders of *Persia*, *Scythia*, &c. and to call him by the Title of the Neighbour Country which he was desired to take care of. I have oft enough in other Writings proved, that the Councils were but Imperial, (supposing that some few under Pagans, that affected the Countenance of the *Roman* Greatness, who were Neighbours, did rarely joyn themselves): And that *Reynerius* confesseth, that the *Armenians* and other Churches converted by the Apostles, were not under the Bishop of *Rome:* And that *Theodoret* giveth the Reason why the Bishop of *Nisibis* was at the Council of *Nice*, because *Nisibis* was then under the *Roman* Empire: And that the *Abassines*, the *Persians*, *Indians*, outer *Armenians*, and many other Countries of Christians without the Empire, were not represented in the Councils, nor ever subjected themselves to the Pope of *Rome*.

4. And even since the days of *Boniface* who obtained of *Phocas* the Name of Universal Bishop, the Christian World was never under him. For 1. The *Greek* Church hath ever since resisted the Claim. 2. The said *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Indians*, and many others never subjected themselves to him. 3. He hath captivated his professed Subjects by so much cruel force, as that he is uncapable of knowing who are his real Subjects by consent: And we have by experience reason to think, that in all Popish Countries it is not one of many that is a Papist understandingly, and at the heart, but most either know not what Popery is, or silently go on with their Neighbours to avoid the obloquy and suffering, which else they must undergo. 4. Dr. *Field* (of the *Church*), and Bishop *Morton* (in his *Apolog.*) have fully proved; That till *Luthers* time, abundance of the Doctors of each Age, though they renounced not the *Roman* Communion, were against their Opinions; and that there is scarce any Doctrine of the Protestants, which men of their own Communion held not. All which fully shew that the Universal Church did never acknowledg or receive this pretended Universal Head. 5. To all which I may add, That all the *Greek* Church (when far larger than the *Latin*) did ever hold the Primacy in the Empire to be *Jure humano* only; which is notorious in the express words of the Council

at

at *Chalcedon*, and in that the Patriarch of *Constantinople* contended for the Primacy, which he could never have done had he taken it to be of Gods Institution: For *Constantinople* being comparatively a novel Church, had no pretence to a Primacy as *Jure Divino*. All which I have further proved elsewhere.

Of all the Arguments brought for the Popes Universal Government I know but Two, that to a considering Man are worthy a Confutation.

The first is from pretended Possession: Christ ruleth his Church not only Preceptively but Eventually *de facto*, according to the great design of his Office, (else he should be but a Nominal King himself,) But Christ hath *Eventually*, or *de facto* ruled his Church by the Pope and his Prelates these Thousand years at least, if not from the beginning: Therefore he Instituted this sort of Government (or else his own Regiment and Design is frustrate).

Ans. 1. As to the Major; the Church of Christ hath obedient and disobedient Professors; Good and Bad, Piety and Sin are in the Church-Visible. The Goodness and Piety, and Obedience is according to his Decree and Purpose; but so is not the Sin. And Christs own Government obtaineth its ends, in the Salvation of his Elect, and in so much restraint and order as he keepeth up among the rest. 2. Else this Argument would prove as much that Idolatry and Heathenism were better than the *Jews* Religion, before Christs Incarnation: For *Judea* was a very little spot of the World, and *de facto* Heathenism did possess most of the rest. 3. Yea it would prove all sin to be of Gods appointment, if we might argue a *facto ad jus*.

2. But the Minor is not true: It is accounted by the best Geographers to be but about a third or fourth part of the Christian World that are Papists at this day, when the decay of the Eastern Churches, and the loss of *Nubia*, and a great part of the *Abassine* Empire, &c. hath much diminished it. I may therefore turn this Argument better against them, and say that Christ never did *de facto* rule his Church, or the greatest part of it by an Universal Governour, nor permit it so to be ruled: Therefore this never was his Design: Though indeed his Will *de debito* must be known by his Laws, and not by Events.

The second Argument is: Though an Universal Head be not of Divine Institution, why may not the Bishops of the Churches set up such a one over them all by consent (or Princes at least)? And why may not an Universal Church be Instituted by Man, as well as a National or Provincial Church?

Ans. 1. Is the Government of Christs Church a matter of so small moment, and is the Soveraign Head no more concerned in it, but to leave it to Men to set up what Government they will? Undoubtedly it is

is the Prerogative of the Soveraign to appoint his own Officers: And he that doth it usurpeth his Prerogative. 2. What men are they that pretend to such Power? were they themselves the Officers of Christ, in any state of Instituted Government? If not; then (1) Christ hath made no Subordinate Government; (2) Then he made no Apostles, *&c.* (3) Then he did not the part of a Soveraign; (4) Then these Men that made the new Government were no Ministers of his, nor had any Power from him to do it. But if they themselves be Christs Instituted Officers; then 1. Christ did Institute certain Officers, and consequently a state of Government. 2. Then let these Ministers of his prove if they can that ever he commissioned them to alter that state of Governmen which he first Instituted; 3. If they cannot, let them confess that it is a Trayterous Usurpation. 4. Either it is a Government Universally needful to the Church, or not: If not, why talk you of it? If yea, who made you either greater or wiser, or better than Christ? that you can find out and settle an Universal Government, which he had not the power, the wisdom or the goodness to Institute? 5. By his Instituting particular Churches, and their Overseers or Elders, and Worship and Discipline, he shewed us that he took such a Church-settlement for his own Work: And if so, what made him do it imperfectly? and how come you to be able to do it better? 6. The World hath had lamentable experience these Thirteen hundred years and more, to how ill effects Men have altered Christs Institutions, and to what proud Contentions, Schisms, Persecutions, and other Calamities, their Alterations have tended. 7. But (to speak fully to the case) we grant that as Christs Ordinances, Doctrine, Worship and Discipline, are distinguished from the meer Circumstances of them, (called the *Circa Sacra*); so when Christ hath Instituted Officers for his own Work, Men may for edification make Officers for their Work; that is, these Circumstances (such as are Church-Wardens, Sextons, Door-keepers, and many the like). But will any man of brains and Christianity hence conclude, that Men may set up an Officer for Christ, above all the Officers of his own Institution, and empowered to over-rule them all, yea and to Silence them, Suspend them, Excommunicate them, and be a Monarch over them all? If Christ would have had such a one, he was as wise and able to do it himself as any of his Ministers are. 8. And it is God that must bless the Labours of his Officers: And he hath no-where promised to bless any but his own. 9. And if Men may make the Papacy, Men may pull it down again when reason requireth it. And it will go harder with the Pope, than either pious *Gerson (de auferibilitate Papæ)*, or Learned Card. *Nic. Cusanus (de Concordia)*, do affirm, it may. 10. But if it be but by Mens consent, that we must have a Pope, let those have none that do not consent: And then most of the Christian World will be without him.

This

This Controversie about an Universal Vicarious Head and Governour, being the true sum of the difference between the Papists and Protestants, were we not now restrained, should be much larglier handled, and fuller proofs of all that we assert annexed. But our necessitated brevity shall conclude with these few Uses.

I. Learn hence to hate the Devilish sin of Pride, and fear it in your selves, left there should be more of it than you have yet observed: For the Pope and his Prelates, are naturally such Sons of *Adam* as our selves: And if Pride in them may rise to such a height, as to make them in this so mad, as to think poor Man hath Capacity, and Right, and Obligation to Govern all the World, or all the Christians in the World, and thereby to become the plagues of the Earth, and the troublers of all Christian States and Churches, have not we all cause to fear it in our selves? Though it have not Temptation or Advantage to work so publickly and mischievously as theirs, alas, it is the same Sin which causeth men to overvalue their own *Understanding*, their *Goodness*, or their *Greatness*: It is the same Sin which setteth some Preachers on contriving, and hunting for preferment, and others for popular applause, and which maketh men Write, and Preach, and Talk against things which they understand not, and against men better than themselves, and to destroy Love and Concord, and tear the Churches, and harden the ungodly in the contempt of all Religion; yea, and to proceed impenitently in all this, while some think that their zeal for Order and Obedience, and others, that their zeal for Truth and Godliness, will warrant them in all this. It's an old Proverb, that all men are born with a Pope in their Bellies: And he is a Conquerour, and a Saint indeed, that hath truely overcome his Pride, which conquereth many that can Preach and Talk against it: And many that cry out of Popery, and Papal pride, do too little detect, and fear, and mortifie, the same pernicious evil in themselves.

II. Learn hence to understand the Grand Difference between the Protestants and the Papists: It is not first, Whether the Pope be the Man that Christ hath made his Universal Vicar, and Governour of all the World? But first, Whether there be *any such* Instituted by Christ or not? For if they once prove that there is any such, we will confess that no other can put in so fair a claim for it as the Pope. The question is not, first, Whether the Church of *Rome* be the true Catholick Church? But first, Whether there be any such thing of Christs Institution, as an Universal Church, Headed by a Vicarious Head, under Christ? We deny the Being of such a Head, and such a Church.

III. Therefore take heed of those disputers that cry up the Catholick Church, as supposing it to have an Universal Head besides Christ (either Pope or Council) as if this must be a granted thing; and then all that we have to do with the Pope, is but to bound and moderate him in,

in his Government: These men say, We are against the abuses of the Court of *Rome*, but not against the Church of *Rome*. But that which a Protestant justly denyeth is, That there is any such Universal Head and Church at all, as the Papists do assert.

IV. And hence observe in what sence it is, that Divines say, that *Rome* is not a true Church, nor Papists as such members of the Church of Christ; we all confess that those called Papists, who practically hold the Essentials of Christianity, and truely believe in Christ the true Head, are all parts of the true Catholick Church, which hath no Head indeed but Christ. But we maintain that the Pope was never made by Christ, the Governour of the Universal Church; and that their pretended Catholick Church, consisting of the Pope as such a Head, and of his Subjects as such, is a Traiterous Combination, and no true Church of Jesus Christ: That Policy was never Instituted by him. And in this sense all Protestants are agreed, while some say that *Rome* is a true Church, and others say that it is not: They mean thus the same thing.

V. And hence you may perceive why they take the Pope to be Antichrist: Because he usurpeth part of the Prerogative and Kingdom of Christ, without his Institution, and against his Laws; by making himself the Governour of all the World or Church, he maketh him as another Christ: As he would be a Traytor to the King, who would usurp the Universal Government of his Kingdoms, as to Legislation, Judgment, and Executions, though he should falsly pretend the Kings Commission for it.

VI. Take heed of a Fleshly, and Worldly Religion. A Fleshly, and Worldly Heart, and Life, lyeth under shame, and remorse of Conscience, till the Devil bring in the defensative of a Fleshly, and Worldly Religion: For Nature, Reason and Experience tell men, that all things below are vanity, in comparison of everlasting things; and therefore the Devil hath no such way, to keep his possession of such Souls in peace, as by making them a Religion suitable to their Worldly minds and interests: And then they will sin against God as by his own Authority, and vilifie his Servants, yea, and burn them as by his own Command, and fight against Christ as by his own Commission, *& in nomine domini incipit omne malum*, as the old Proverb is, taken from the Papal Style. Religion is so excellent, and necessary, that nothing can so successfully prevail in the minds of men against it, as that which cometh in its own garb and name. What men on Earth do Satan more service than men of a Fleshly and Worldly Religion? Who by the power of Carnality, first make themselves, and next, would make others believe, that their own Worldly Interest is the true Interest of Christ, and the Catholick Church; and when they have made their own *Carnal Wills and Interest*, the means of the Churches Peace and Concord (such as they will allow it) then cry up the great names, of Government, Obe-

Obedience, Order, Unity, Concord and Peace, and cry down all that is against them, as Confusion, Rebellion, or Schism; when all signifieth no more, but that they are proud and worldly, and have got the upper ground, and so may name things to their own advantage. When Sin becometh a Religion, it conquereth the Light, and quieteth Conscience, in the most odious actions, and most malignant oppositions of the Truth. I cannot more significantly speak my sense, than in the words of our serious Poet, Mr. *George Herbert*, in his *Church Militant*, p. 188, 189, 190.

" *Sin being not able to extirpate quite*
" *The Churches here, bravely resolv'd one night*
" *To be a Church-man too and wear a Miter*, &c.

But it is too long to be Transcribed.

If the Archbishop of *Canterbury* should tell all the World, that no Man can be a true Christian, or be saved, that believeth not in him, and becometh not his obedient Subject, and should send out men to Preach this on the pretence of Unity, Obedience, and Peace; Would not all the World deride this, as a worldly presumptuous kind of Religion? Just such is Popery, which saith the same of one that the Roman Emperour made the chief Bishop in his own Principality; and now when that Empire is dissolved, claimeth the Government of all Christian Kings and People in the whole World. Is it not a wonder of stupidity; that such a Religion, is not derided, and despised by all mankind that have the use of Reason?

VII. Lastly, Take heed of hasty trusting fair pretences, when so absurd a thing, and great a mischief, as the Papal Universal Government, may have such good words to promote it, as *Unity*, *Concord*, *Obedience*, &c. And so many deceived persons to entertain it.

Quest. *What is the mischief of this pretended Headship?*

Answ. First, It constituteth a Humane Universal Church: whose name deceiveth men, and keepeth the Divine Catholick Church to many unknown.

Secondly, This Humane Church is set up above, and against the true Universal Church of Christ; and arrogateth Power to depress, abuse, and persecute the Churches that Christ hath Instituted.

Thirdly, Hereupon it introduceth a Humane Religion, which is as injurious to the Religion instituted by Christ.

Fourthly, It cheateth Millions of Souls, by making them believe that they are good Christians, because they are Subjects to the Bishop of *Rome*, which they call, being of the right Church.

Fifthly, It becometh the Grand Engine of dividing Christians, and destroying Love, and raising Bloody Persecutions, and hindering Unity which they cry up. For when Christ hath made the terms of Christian Concord to be few and easie, and such as all Christians are agreed in, Concord is hereby accordingly made easie: But when an Usurper will come and add his Forgeries, and impossible Terms, which Christians neither do, nor ever did agree in, what more effectual and pernicious art could have been used, to divide the Churches? If nothing but Allegiance to the King be required to the Concord of his Kingdoms, all Loyal Subjects would be as one: But if a Subject will step up and say, you shall also swear to me, as the Universal Viceroy, or have no Peace, when he proveth no such Power, and the Subjects take it to be Treason to be Sworn to him without the Kings command; Would not this set all the Kingdom together by the ears?

Sixthly, And then, when men are possessed with this false opinion, that all Christians must be united in subjection to the Pope, it will pervert the minds of the very lovers of Unity and Peace, and harden them in the guilt of wicked Persecution, as if it were their duty as the friends of Unity, to root out all those as enemies to it, who refuse their false and traiterous means.

Seventhly, And I may add that the poor Pope himself is hereby made the most miserable of mortal men, while he undertaketh the Pastoral charge of millions and myriads, even of many Kingdoms and Empires, which he never can nor will perform, and so must answer for betraying and deceiving all these Souls.

Quest. *But if there be no such thing as an Universal Church, Headed and Governed by a Vicarious Head under Christ, What is the true Universal Church, and what is its true Government?*

Answ. First, The Universal Church on Earth, is all Christians Headed only by Christ, as having the sole power and capacity, of Universal Legislation, Judgment, Execution, and Protection.

Secondly, The true Government is this; 1. All forcible Government by the Sword, even about matters in Religion, belongeth to Kings and Magistrates only, in their several dominions.

Secondly, The Power of the Word, and Church-Keys (to judg who shall be in the Communion of the Church) belongeth to the Bishops or Pastors of the particular Churches respectively.

Thirdly, These Bishops or Pastors being obliged to as much Concord as they can attain, are bound to hold correspondence with one another by Delegates, Letters, or Synods, as far as the End (Church-Concord) doth make necessary.

Fourthly, If they offend and abuse their Office, they are under the Government of the Magistate, who may chastise them.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, If the Pastor be an Infidel, or Enemy, and will not do his duty, *Cyprian* long ago told us, that the people must obey God before a wicked Pastor, and as he hath no power to *force them*, so they are not bound to consent, to sin against God, or betray the Church and their own Souls, for the will or interest of unfaithful Pastors.

Sixthly, And when all is done, we must never dream of attaining in this World a perfect Unity and Peace, nor till we come where Knowledg, Love, and Holiness, are all perfect: of which, see more in my small popular Treatise called *Catholick Unity*.

SERMON III.

KINGS and EMPEROURS, not rightful Subjects to the POPE.

Act. 26. 2. *I think my ſelf happy King* Agrippa, *becauſe I ſhall anſwer for my ſelf this day before thee, &c.*

THough I cannot this day aſſume to my ſelf that happineſs the Apoſtle did, that he did Apologize before a King who was expert in all the Cuſtoms of the *Jews*, verſ. 3; Yet (I do ſuppoſe) I may account my ſelf happy, that I am to Apologize for Kings and Emperours, who do know, and have aſſumed to themſelves their Royal Prerogatives granted to them from the King of Kings by whom they reign, confirmed to them by him who is ſet upon the Holy Hill of Zion; and infringed, eluded, or uſurped by a Pretended Vicegerent, whoſe Right and Reaſon in his Pretences are no greater than his Humility or Modeſty in the claim and exerciſe of his Power. Whileſt I treat of this important Affair, I hope you that are my Auditors will do me reaſon to hear me patiently; and I humbly ſubmit the Diſcourſe to thoſe ſacred Perſons whoſe cauſe needeth no more, or greater Advocates than have already appear'd in it: And if the immodeſt reſtleſneſs of incroachers do occaſion a neceſſary Apology for this Cauſe, it deſerveth a much better than now is by others deſire, not his own choice, put upon it. If there be any thing leſs becoming the greatneſs of the Cauſe, and the excellency of the Perſons, and (as I fore-

Prov. 8. 15. Pſal. 2.

foreſee it will be) not worthy the favourable acceptance of the meaneſt Prince; yet I humbly pray the favourable interpretation, and gracious pardon of all that my own weakneſs hath rendred defective; and a condeſcending acceptance of what the ſtrength of Reaſon, the reſentment of Duty, the obligation of Oaths, the dictates of Nature, the Command of God, and a vowed Loyalty to my Great and Gracious Soveraign, have in this (ſo much his) Cauſe better performed. With this deſired candor and hoped favour I return to my Work, which lyeth in the Text I have read, becauſe in that either directly or conſequentially lieth this Theſis.

Kings and Emperours are not rightful Subjects to the Pope, neither hath he Power for pretended or real Hereſie to Excommunicate and Depoſe them, nor to Abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance; but even the Clergy are ſubject to Secular Princes, and their Bodies and Eſtates under their Government.

In which *Theſis* (I obſerve) *two* different ſort of *Propoſitions*, the *firſt Negative*, the *other Poſitive*; and theſe kind of Propoſitions in the Schools are differently treated, for the Poſitives are to be proved by the Opponent, the Negative to be defended by the Reſpondent; ſo ſhould *Rome* if the Pope would carry his Cauſe, prove his own Right, which he can as eaſily now as ever; and with juſt ſuch Arguments as formerly make good; whileſt *immodeſt Claims, forcible Uſurpations, enſlaved Councils, citations of treaſonable Decretals, appellations to ſeditious Canon-Law, blaſphemous appropriation of Omnipotency, ſelf-deſigning flatteries, and vowed obedience to the Pope againſt Nature, Reaſon and Religion*; Whileſt theſe are accounted good proofs, what *Romaniſts* will think the Pope an Uſurper? or his Wars againſt the Emperour Rebellion? May all Chriſtian Kings enjoy their undoubted Rights, and keep in the undiſturbed Poſſeſſion of them until ſuch Arguments of weak and ſenſleſs become ſtrong and reaſonable, his *Roman* Holineſs will ſcarce think the reverſion worth his thanks, if it be bequeath'd him, or worthy of his hope if it be promiſed him on ſuch Terms, and on better I truſt he will never have it. This Negative part of the Poſition (for reaſons kept to my ſelf) I do caſt into the latter part of my Diſcourſe, *The Poſitive Poſition*, viz. *The Clergy are ſubject to Secular Princes, and their Bodies and Eſtates under their Government*, I put in the firſt place, and ſhall firſt handle it; whence the Negative Propoſitions will as conſequences follow and take their own place. Now here it is neceſſary I

The Summary of the Popes Right, and its Proofs.

1. Explain the Terms which are here uſed, and ſtate the Theſis.
2. Confirm the Theſis ſo ſtated.
3. Diſcover the Doctrine and Doctors who avow the contrary.
4. Give you their Reaſons, and an Anſwer to them.
5. Preſent you with ſome Corollaries from the Diſcourſe.

Method of the Diſcourſe.

Sect. 1.

Who meant by Clergy in the ſenſe of Scripture and Eccleſiaſtick Writers.

Sect. I. The firſt Term to be explained is *Clergy*, which admits of both a Scriptural ſenſe, and an Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe: in the Scripture-ſenſe it doth lay it ſelf out to ſuch extent as far exceedeth the meaning of it in Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe, as is evident from the uſe of the word κλῆρος, both in the *Old Teſtament, and in the *New, where it comprehendeth all the People that are in the Congregation of the Lord, thus the Laity are κλῆρος, the Inheritance of the Lord. But the favour of *Rome* is not ſo great toward the people, as to underſtand them a part of thoſe whom they do aſſert exempted from the Secular Government, it were too immodeſt to ſpoil Princes of all their Subjects.* *In the Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe*, as it hath been taken for many hundred years in all ſort of Writers, *in the Acts of Councils*, *in the Controverſies of Diſputants*, *in the Narratives of Hiſtorians*, and now in the common language of both Proteſtants and Papiſts it is reſtrained to men in Eccleſiaſtical Office by Ordination and Dedication to Divine Miniſtrations, called by the Church of *England*, as well as by Papiſts (*Sacerdotes*) Prieſts; to whom *Rome* vindicates a freedom from the Government of the Secular Power: In brief I underſtand here by Clergy, theſe laſt mentioned, and all Religious Perſons, (of which multitudes are ſwarming under the Papacy) ſuch as *Abbots*, *Priors*, *Monks*, *Friers*, *Jeſuits*, &c. together with their Feminine Votaries, *Abbeſſes*, *Nuns*, &c. All theſe whether jointly, or a-part conſidered, are the perſons I underſtand by Clergy. Theſe are,

* Deut. 40. 20. Εἶναι αὐτῷ λαὸν ἔγκλη-ρον. And Deut. 9. 29. * οἱ δοῦλοι λαός σου καὶ κλῆρός σου, 1 Pet. 5. 3. *Cleros autem vocat non Diaconos aut Preſbyteros, ſed gregem qui cuique forte contigit Gubernandus.* Eraſm. *in loc.* So *Vatablus* & *Grotius* explain the word.

* *Non negamus appellationem iſtam----antiquam eſſe & ante multa Secula in Eccleſiâ obtinuiſſe.* Pp. Salm. Theſ. Theol.

* *Per Sacerdotes intelligimus Novi Teſtamenti miniſtros præſertim Eccleſiæ Antiſtites, quos antiqui Patres, quia non civili aliquo ſed ſacro munere funguntur, Sacerdotes appellarunt,* Davenant. Determ. q. 15.

Sect. II. *Subject*, i.e. *Not only De facto*, becauſe the Power of the Secular Prince is ſo formidable that they do not, becauſe they dare not, deny him obedience; to which *Henry the Eighth* might well aſcribe the moſt of the good behaviour of the Papiſtical Religious whom he ſubverted, but *de Jure* they are ſubjected; *God*, *Nature*, *Gratitude*, *Oaths*, *Religion*, and *neceſſary Conſtitutions of humane Laws* have ſubjected them. In the words of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 13. 5. *Wherefore they muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath, but for Conſcience ſake.* That is (as *Grotius* well Paraphraſeth it) *not only out of fear of puniſhment which the Law threatneth, but out of Conſcience, becauſe Chriſt hath commanded it.*

Non Solo pœnæ metu quam ſæpe minantur ſed quia Chriſtus id præcepit. Grot. in loc.

The Subjection we ſpeak of then is a voluntary, free, cheerful and dutiful Obedience which is due to the Civil Magiſtrate, and not an enforced Subjection; It is the reſult of Law, Conſcience, and Love, not only the reſult of Fear and Compulſion. It is our Duty, and the Magiſtrates Due.

Properly and ſtrictly all Princes are Secular.

Sect. III. *The next Term* to be explained is *Secular Princes*, where by the way note, That *Princes are properly Secular*, *their Dignity*, *Power*, *and Government* is (*quoad Originem*) in its riſe *Divine*; *the Powers that are*,

are, are of God, but (*quo ad objecta*) as to the *things they do take cognisance of, they are* (though not solely, yet) *Primarily Secular.* And (*quoad externam formam*) as to the manner of pomp and state which may render the Government more Awful, 'tis and justly is, ordered and determined (*prout sapientiæ principis visum est*) as seemeth good to the wisdom of the Prince, and so is Secular. *But what through the Royal favour of some good Princes; and more through the Ambition and Usurpations of Popish Ecclesiasticks*, who have invested themselves with Principalities, and a Power equal with the Princes of this World; *It is become necessary we should distinguish Princes into Secular and Ecclesiastical:* The Secular being those Princes which we will call now Temporal and Civil; The Ecclesiastical such as the Pope, his Cardinals, and some Bishops, such as the Spiritual Electors in the Empire, *&c.* To which Inferiour Clergy do with less scruple acknowledg, and pay their ready Subjection; beside which I doubt not to assert, (and hope I shall be able to prove) they do owe a Subjection, and Obedience to the Temporal, Civil, *i.e.* Secular Prince; of which a word or two, that we may not mistake, or be mistaken. Now this term *Prince* may be *taken* either 1. In *respect to the Person*; or 2. In *respect to the Office*; In the first sense it referreth to Governments in a single Person, as in Kingdoms, in the latter it referreth to Government, managed by a State or Council, as of old in the *Roman* Commonwealth; or now in the Commonwealths of *Venice, Genoa*, or the *Dutch. Neither of these may be excluded*, where the Clergy are Subjects to a King, as in *France*, or *Spain*, they are his rightful Subjects: Where they are under a Commonwealth they are Subjects to the Secular Power; *i.e.* they owe Subjection to the Supream Civil Magistrate; as to their perpetual honour, and to the good example of all Christendom, the Illustrious Republick of *Venice* made both the proud Pope *Paul* the Fifth, and the stubborn Clergy of their State to learn and acknowledg, (διὰ τὴν ὄψιν) out of fear of the Magistrates Power, when they would not (διὰ τὸν σωφρονισμὸν) out of sense of their own Duty. *Again*, ere I leave this, *a Prince may be considered* either with respect to Subjects that,

First, Are born Subjects to whom the Supream Magistrate is *Native Prince; to whom they owe fealty, and allegiance, whether they have sworn it, or not:* Their Oath strengthens a former, but createth not their first obligation to Allegiance. This is coæval with their Persons, and is Natural. Or,

Secondly, Princes may be *considered with* respect to *Subjects* that are such, *occasionally*, and *Pro tempore*, as when either necessary occasions, invite or call men into a forreign Princes Countreys, or when an arbitrary choice out of curiosity, or the like, bringeth men into a forreign Jurisdiction: The case of Merchants, Students, and Travellers, whilest they are in those Countreys, they are in Conscience bound by the just known Laws of that Land; and if they transgress those Laws,

to

Whence it is that we must now distinguish into Princes Secular and Ecclesiastical.

Who these are.

Princes personally considered, or with respect to the Government.

Ecclesiasticks rightful Subjects to either Monarchs, Commonwealths, as was excellently and effectually asserted by the *Venetians* against *Paul* the 5th.

Princes and Subjects Natural and perpetual.

Each may be so occasionally and temporary, as Merchants, Students and Travellers abroad.

to the forfeiture of State, Limb, or Life; the favour of the Prince may save the Criminal: But there is no benefit of Clergy can exempt him from the Jurisdiction of the Prince, or rescue him from the execution of the Law, by their Ministers of Justice.

Fourth Term explained, the Persons of Ecclesiasticks subject to restraints of Law.

Sect. IV. The next thing to be explained is, *How their Bodies are*, said to be, *under Government of the Civil or Secular Prince.* In short their Persons are

First, Both *liable to Arrests*, Restraints, Imprisonments, and Coercion, *as* there *shall be a just cause*, or suspicion of just cause.

Sentence of Law, against great crimes.

Secondly, And *obnoxious to the sentence of the Law, according to the nature of their offence, so* as either to lose Life, or Limb, or suffer by Stripes, or Stigmatizing, or Exile, or loss of Liberty, or any like corporal Penalty.

Common services for publick good in extream exigencies.

Thirdly, What personal services the community of the lay-Subjects are bound to do for their Countrey and their Prince, the Clergy are bound to (though usually exempt from it through the favour of their Prince) and in an urgent necessity, on the command of their Prince, they may be obliged; and ought to afford their Assistance. (As in case of an Invasion to Arm, or in an assault of a City to defend it, or in the danger of his Prince's Person to rescue him with the Labour, Courage, and Hazard of his own Life) That Clergy-man, who in a storm would not obey the Pilots order, and take his turn at the Pump, to save the Vessel, and Goods, with his own Life and the Life of others; were as unworthy of a room in the Ship, as other lading that is cast over-board to prevent a danger from its weight.

Fifth Term explained, Estates of Clergy.

Sect. V. *The Estates of the Clergy*, are next to be considered, and that in divers respects.

Hereditary Subjects as other inheritances.

First, *Their inheritances from their Fathers, do not by the Sons being a Clergy Man, become free from the common burthens*, which Authority layeth on the Publick or generality of the Subjects for defraying publick charges.

Beneficiary chargeable for publick good.

Secondly, *The Lands and Estates of their preferments* of what sort soever, *are* in like manner *chargeable, if the Magistrate judgeth it necessary* and equal: And in such case they ought to obey as readily as other men, when their Prince with advice and consent of such Counsel as can duely impose it on others, have imposed it on them.

Social may be limited, taxed, regulated. Beneficiaries may be suspended or deprived on male-administration.

Thirdly, *The Estates of Ecclesiastical Societies are under the Government* of the Secular Authority, as well as the Estates of Lay-Societies and Corporations, *to limit* their increase by gifts, as by our Statute of *Mortmain*: *To enquire and compel them*, to imploy them to *the uses for which they were given*, as by commission of charitable uses.

Fourthly, The *Estates of Clergy-men* which are (*beneficia &c.*) *given us encouragement* to them, and reward *of their labour*, and duties discharged;

are

are ſo under the Civil Magiſtrate's Government, *that he may eject and remove the negligent*, and incorrigible male-adminiſtrators in that Office, as in other caſes of male-adminiſtration. Though it may be moſt convenient to do this by Clergy-men, as Co-adjutors in the proceſs; yet the Authoritative determination deriveth it ſelf from the ſupreme Magiſtrate, who as He judgeth the Offender unworthy of the Truſt of ſuch an Office, ſo may diſpoſſeſs him of the Benefit and Eſtate belonging to it.

Such Eſtates may be conferred on others who ſhall diſcharge the truſt.

Fifthly, *The Eſtates ſo taken from the one, may by the Power which juſtly took them away, be adjudged to another, who may better diſcharge the Office, and deſerve the Benefice.* And in this caſe the Clergy-man muſt be ſubject, though poſſibly an error may be in the judgment paſſed, and no legal way be left for his relief; as fell out in the deprivation of the Proteſtant Miniſters by Queen *Mary*.

Eſtates of Clergy-men, forfeitable as other mens.

Sixthly, *The Eſtates of Clergy-men are forfeitable on crimes of high nature, as well as other mens Eſtates.* Treaſon, of which (with or without leave from *Rome*, I ſay) a Clergy-man may be guilty, will forfeit his eſtate, and the Prince may (on conviction at leaſt) ſeize it.

Sixth Term opened under Government, *de jure*, and not only *facto*.

Sect. 6. I come to the laſt Term to be opened, *Are under their Government*; where I do remind you, that *we ſpeak* now *of matter of Right, not of matter of Fact ſeparate from Right*: Their Perſons, and Eſtates, ought to be under the Government of the ſecular Prince, as their Rightful Lord and Governour. Now Government,

Protection of Government, Clergy importunately claim.

First, *It for Protection* and defence: Governours are ſhields of the Earth, and Heirs of reſtraint, a praiſe to them that do well, and they watch over their people as Sheepherds: whence the Poet rightly called his Prince ποίμνα λαῶν: And here, in this part, none do with ſuch importunate clamors, and immodeſt injunctions expect a ſhare, as the diſloyal Shavelins; as if the ſecular Arm were framed to the Body-Politick, only to defend the Perſons and Eſtates of Eccleſiaſticks, and to offend all others.

Herein Shavelins are immodeſt.

Directive Government allow'd by ſome: But this allowance vaniſheth when to be exerciſed over Popiſh Clergy.

Secondly, *It Directive*; and this, ſome of them will indeed allow the ſecular Magiſtrate over the Clergy; but ere the Magiſtrate can get clear of them with this ſmall allowance of his right, it fares with him as they ſay, it doth with thoſe who receive money of Witches, or the Devil, when they come to uſe it, 'tis vaniſht or turned into withered leaves. For,

Coercive Government, this the Popiſh Clergy reject.

Thirdly, *The Coercive Power* of the Civil Magiſtrate in Governing them, they with more Wit than good manners, or dutifulneſs, endeavour to wreſt from the Magiſtrate; and when he hath parted with the Power of puniſhing the ill-natur'd diſobedience of the Clergy, he muſt content himſelf with ſuch a meaſure of obſervance, as may no whit infringe the Clergie's Immunities, and Rights of Holy-mother, which you may be aſſured their diſcretion will make leſs, than their good

Directive without Coercive Power an Engine to debase Sovereignty.

Nature would ſeem to allow: Indeed a Directive Power without Coercive, is an Engine to pull down the honour of a Prince, and to exalt the ſtubborn humour of every Male-contented Subject, a fit Project for *Rome*; and ſome brain-ſick Millenarie, who in his hot fit dreameth of a Crown for himſelf on Earth. But our *Theſis* intends to Subject the Clergy of *Rome* (for our own, they readily acknowledg it, and live) in a ſubjection to the directive Government of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, as the Rule of their Duty, and to the Coercive Government as the juſt Rule of puniſhment for neglect of their duties.

Civil Government, though not Chriſtian, hath both a Power Directive and Coercive over the Clergy.

Fourthly, *Where the Government ſecular is not Chriſtian, yet in all juſt and lawful commands, the Clergy is ſubject to the Directive Power of it*; and *in commands unjuſt* and unlawful, *their Perſons and Eſtates are under the Coercive Power*, though it ſhould be *exerciſed* to the *higheſt degree of Perſecution*: And I do not remember beſide Prayers, Supplications, Patience, and Tears, any remedy left them for the laſt relief, but an honeſt, peaceable and juſtifiable flight from their rage, and cruelty. I added this over and above, ſeeing our *Theſis* ſpeaks of ſubjection to Princes, who are ſuppoſed Chriſtians, and not Heathens. Summarily then the Clergy, who by the Pope and his Law are exempt from the juriſdiction of the ſecular Prince in all caſes, are ſo far from a due and rightful claim to ſuch exemption, that in all caſes Civil and Criminal, and Eccleſiaſtical, they are both as to their Perſons and Eſtates, ſubject to the Directive and Coercive Power of the Secular Prince, be he a Chriſtian, or Heathen Magiſtrate; in ſo much, that the Clergy owe him an Active obedience in the due and lawful exerciſe of his Directive Power: and in the undue exerciſe thereof, the Clergy as others owe him a Paſſive obedience, and neither may reſiſt by force, or appeal from him to a Forreigner, to evade or null his Coercive Power.

The Summary of the Theſis ſtated.

The ſtate of the Poſition thus laid down, I come to the ſecond thing propoſed, *viz.* To prove that the Clergy are ſubject to the Secular Prince, *&c.* And ſo

2. General Theſis proved.

St. *Paul* knew none, nor claimed any ſuch exemption, therefore there was none for him.

1. Firſt, *I argue from the Text*, a Majore ad Minus; *St. Paul was a Clergy man, fitter to be truſted with ſuch an exemption from obedience to the Secular Prince, than any of our Preſent Clergy*: And if any ſuch Priviledg had been given by Chriſt, or had been inherent in the Office, he would have known it, claimed it, and ſtood on it; But St. *Paul* knew none ſuch, ſtood not upon any ſuch Priviledg: Therefore ſurely there is none ſuch inherent in the Clergy, or annexed to the Clergy. I think there is not much doubt to be made, whether 1. He were a Clergy-man, who had his commiſſion from God and Chriſt, without the ceremonies with which men do ordain to that Office. Or 2. Whether he were concerned to plead his Priviledg if he had any; for it was a Caſe that toucht his Life, wherein he now was engaged. Or 3. Whether he might be bold on account of his Innocency to claim his Priviledg, ſince his judges determined he had done nothing worthy of Death

Rom. 1. 1. & Gal. 1. 1.

Acts 25. 25, & c. 26. 31.

or

or of Bonds, *Act.* 26:31. Had one of our Roman Priests been thus seized, imprisoned, impleaded, and endangered; we should soon have heard him, excepting to the jurisdiction of the Court, and appealing from an Incompetent Judg, and shuffling off the Process with importunate clamours, that he was a Spiritual Man, and not to be call'd to account by a Temporal Power. But here you find nothing of such an appeal, which cannot be imputed to the Nescience of the Apostle who was inspired by the Infallible Spirit: He would have known it if there had been any such exemption, nor may it with colour of Reason be said, he would not make use of his Priviledg, and that he did relax of his Right. * For 1. This would be supposed against all Reason, 1. His Life was then in question. 2. He was a Man would make use of his Priviledges, as when he pleaded himself a *Roman*. 3. He should have asserted his Priviledg, that from his testimony, succeeding Ecclesiasticks might firmly prove theirs, though he could not have gotten clear of their hands. 4. His silence in the Case hath done the Church much wrong, which date the Immunities, some Centuries later than *Paul*'s time. 5. Whereas, Had he been as Zealous, and Wise as our *Roman* Priests now are; He had been more faithful to his Trust, and we had more clearly proved our Right. Farther yet, 6. It seemeth little short of a culpable dissimulation, that he should count, or profess to count himself happy that he was to answer before a Secular Prince. Nothing can be imagined more unbeseeming him who was set for the defence of the Gospel, than such tame and soft Cowardise as he was guilty of, on the supposition of these pretended exempts. No, St. *Paul* would never have betrayed the Preachers of the Gospel, and the Religious in all ages succeeding; but have at least owned his Right to the Priviledg (if there had been any such,) before *Festus*, who was under the *Roman Cæsar*, Governour of *Judea*; and so Judg in *Paul*'s Case, though *Agrippa* was but an honourable Auditor.

Anselme question'd whether an appeal to the Vicar of St. *Peter*, be a breach of Allegiance to a Terrene Prince; but soon let *William Rufus* know what he must trust to. Refused to do homage to *H.* 2. & bore it out on the Authority of *Urban* and the Council of *Rome*; and of *Pascal* 3. then *P. Tho. Becket*'s *Salvo ordine suo*, and his inflexible opposition to *H.* 2. who promoted him, and was his Native Lord and Sovereign stands on record, a witness of his ingratitude and rebellious humour against his Prince and Benefactor, who found *Tho. Becket* most resolute to exempt the Clergy, though guilty of Murthers, from the judgment of the Secular Prince; that he might preserve the usurped Priviledges of the Church, when Reason, Law, and Gods own Word required just execution on such crimes proved against the Clergy.

And of later years, the like bred a quarrel betwixt the Serene Republick of *Venice*, and *Paul* the fifth.

* It is *Bellarmine*'s Evasion, and *Suarez* approves it, *qui dicit Paulum non jure sed facto Cæsarem appellasse.—Nam jurisdictione exemptus erat utiq; jure divino sed quia alia ratione non poterat inimicorum insidias Evitare.*

I conclude therefore this Argument, the Clergy of this present Age, and of Ages past are as much under the Secular Government as was St. *Paul*; But he was so much under it, that he accounted himself happy, that he might have a candid hearing before the Secular Power, and could find no Priviledg to exempt himself: Therefore neither have our present Clergy any such Priviledg of exemption, and should acknow-

ledg it a happineſs to defend a juſt cauſe before an Impartial Judg, and no wrong to be adjudged to a deſerved correction for any crime condemned by the righteous Laws of their Sovereign Prince.

2. What was juſt and right, and ought to be owned by St. *Paul* a Clergy-man in the point of ſubjection to the Secular Power, that is juſt, right, & ought to be owned in the point of ſubjection to the Secular Authority now by the Clergy. This Propoſition I think will need no proof, and if it ſhould we ſhall meet with due place for it. But S. *Paul* owned this Subjection as what was juſt, right, and which ought to be. Now this Propoſition is almoſt in expreſs terms in that, *Act.* 25. 10. *I ſtand before Cæſars judgment-ſeat* *; (Which Phraſe comprehendeth the whole matter of his Subjection) *where I ought to be judged*, which paſſage excludeth any juſt exception; *I ſtand at Cæſars judgment ſeat; de facto, he was now before the Supream Authority Civil* *, and leſt any ſhould ſurmiſe that he did tacitely repine at it, or that we argue *a facto ad jus*; *It is added by Saint* Paul, *Where I ought to be judged.* I know ſome ſay that St. *Paul* did not this as what was of right to be done, but what was then moſt ſafe to be done, and becauſe he could not otherwiſe eſcape the hands of the *Jews*; To which I Anſwer,

*Ritè Tribunal *Cæſaris vocat quod Procurator habebat nomine & mandato Cæſaris.* Grot. in loc.

*As *Bellarmine* and *Suarez*, &c. of that profeſſion (who are by Profeſſion and would gladly be in Practice ſons of Belial, *i.e.* without a Superiour) affirm *Paulum non jure ſed facto Cæſarem appellaſſe.*

(1.) That the word δεῖ) may in ſome places be ſo taken to denote what muſt in a caſe be done, without reſpect to dueneſs and right; but from this it may be ſo taken [to the Jeſuits, *Muſt be ſo taken*] is too weak an inference.

Mat. 17. 10. Ἠλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν, and Mat. 18. 33. οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλεῆσαι;

(2) The *Greek* δεῖ in the New Teſtament doth in moſt places denote that which ought *ex debito, juſtoque ordine*, to be done, and ſo the *Muſt* is a Moral *Muſt* reſulting from the dueneſs of the thing, and that this is ſo the places cited in the Margent will prove. And yet farther we ſay,

Mat. 23. 23. ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι; and ſo *cap.* 24. 6. & 25. 26. and five times in St. *Mark.* And St. *Luke* whoſe phraſe is moſt near the pure *Greek* doth uſe it Nineteen times, of which I think not one but requireth, or beſt beareth the Interpretation, *juxta debitum & ex jure.* And when he uſeth it in the *Acts*, of 24, or 25 places, ſcarce two will bear other ſenſe than what comports with the dueneſs of Office, or comelineſs of order, or ſuch like iſſuing into a Moral *Muſt*, which is the ſame with Duty, and which is rightly expreſt by *we ought.*

1 Cor. 8. 2. οὐδέν ἔγνωκα καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι.

1 Cor. 15. 25. δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν; and 2 Cor. 2. 3. ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν; and c. 5. 10. ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ; and Epheſ. 6. 20. ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. So Col. 4. and 1 Theſ. 4. 1. πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν. And in his Epiſtles to *Timothy*, to *Titus*, [illegible] to the *Hebrews*, he ſtill ſo uſeth the word δεῖ of which we now do treat.

πρὸ

(ὑπὲρ ὃ δεῖ) *above what he ought, &c.* And ſo in other his Epiſtles his τὸ δεον, or his *Muſt* is what is right and ought, *ex debito & juſto rerum ordine*, not what muſt of neceſſity be done. And this had ſo paſſed in the Text if it had not been ſo much againſt the Privileg of theſe *Roman* Clergy, who cannot now bear the plain and literal meaning of this Word of God, becauſe they will not keep in the place to which the Word of God aſſigned them.

(4) The Apoſtle could not without ſin of a high nature according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* thus appeal to a Secular Judg; and now think with your ſelves whether to gratifie the Jeſuits and Clergy of *Rome* we ſhall make the Apoſtle guilty in ſo high a nature, and tranſgreſſing his own rule, by doing evil that good may come of it; the judgment for which ſin ſlumbers not.

So *Paſchal* chargeth King *Henry* the firſt of *England*, that he gave not honour to St. *Peter*, not to the Lord, becauſe no Appeals came to *Rome*, i.e. Pope. *Tho. Becket* by way of Penance ſuſpended himſelf from Prieſtly function for conſenting once that Prieſts ſhould be tried by Secular Power for Robberies, Murthers, &c. And he calls the Royal Decrees of the King and Parliament at *Clarendon*, for trying ſuch crimes of the Clergy, wicked devices, *Baron. ad. Ann.* 1167. *Sect.* 26.

(5) So by this Gloſs we ſhall fairly make every reſolute (not to call them obſtinate) Prieſt that refuſed to own the Supream Power of his Soveraign Prince, and choſe rather to die condemned according to juſt Laws againſt Traytors, and ſo died a ſtout and brave Martyr for the Truth and the Church; When *Paul* through weakneſs of courage, or crafty ſhifts betrays the juſt Rights of the Church, which aſperſion you do as much abhor I know as becomes good Chriſtians. Let them for ever remain Traytors to their Prince, who avow Appeals from him to an alien pretended Superiour; St. *Paul* would not out of deſign do it, he was too honeſt, he knew he could not of right do ſo, though his Perſon and Cauſe were Eccleſiaſtical, his Supream Secular Prince ought have the hearing of it, *I ſtand* (ſaith he) *at Cæſars Judgment-ſeat where I ought to be judged.*

Such a Saint and Martyr was *Tho. Becket* in diſpoſition of mind, though (pity 'twas) he never was brought to legal trial for his treaſonable practices. Such were *Exmew*, *Middlemore*, and alſo Sir *Thomas Moor*, with many others, who ſacrificed their lives for a forreign Uſurper againſt their Natural Prince.

Nidigate executed for denying the Supremacy in *Hen.* 8. time, and Biſhop *Fiſher*,

(6) Laſtly, what-ever weakneſs or obſcurity may be in my arguing from the Text, yet I am ſure the Text doth more plainly and more irrefragably aſſert *Cæſars* Juriſdiction over this eminent Eccleſiaſtick than all the Texts produced to that end do prove the exemption of the Clergy from the Civil Magiſtrates Judgment, or their Subjection to the Pope. I cannot renounce common ſenſe at ſo eaſie a rate as to ſay Chriſt ſaid thrice to *Peter*, *feed*, *&c.* therefore the Pope is the Supream Judg of Eccleſiaſtick Perſons and Cauſes in the whole Church; or if I were ſo eaſie an Arguer I ſhould through the frailty of clear

ſenſe

ſenſe more readily make this Heretical Concluſion, All Clergy-men inferiour to Saint *Paul* ought to own their Subjection to the Civil Authority without appeal from the Supream Power of their Prince; becauſe St. *Paul* owned it his duty, and *Cæſars* right by that Confeſſion, *I ſtand before Cæſars Judgment-ſeat where I ought to be judged.* If the *Romaniſts* be of his opinion, who when he was told that it was the Doctrine of St. *Paul*, which was aſſerted in oppoſition to his Tenet, made a quick reply, I am not of *Pauls* mind, I ſhall not take my ſelf bound to reconcile them to his opinion; if we cannot have their company herein, we ſhall not much want it whileſt we have ſuch good company as St. *Paul* and *Cæſar*. In next place,

Third Proof from Scripture.

Thirdly, I argue Clergy-men, Bodies and Eſtates are as other Subjects under the Government of the Secular Prince: Thus, *They who are included in the Community, on whom the Word of God chargeth Subjection to Princes as a duty, are under the Government of the Prince.* None can doubt this who doubt not that all is duty which the Divine Law chargeth on us in our places; But now *the Clergy are included in the Community*, which is apparent by that univerſal Propoſition of the Apoſtle in *Rom.* 13. 1. *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher Powers.* It is now exploded (though pretending to *Origen* as to the Author) that this is meant of the Animal, not Spiritual man, *i.e.* the Clergy-man. Time was when ſuch a gloſs paſſed current with ſome whoſe Intereſt it was the Scripture ſhould be eluded, rather than plain duty underſtood; and the aſpiring ambition of Papal Clergy nipt in the bud. Now it is clear, that the Apoſtle retaineth the *Hebrew* Dialect, *Every ſoul*, i.e. *every man.* So that either our Papal Clergy muſt diſclaim their kindred with Mankind, or elſe with their whole Family be ſubject to the Prince.

Argutius quam verius, ſaith *Eraſmus* in loc.

Omnis anima dixit pro omni homine. Eraſm. *Vatablus. Omnis anima pro quovis homine. In utroque Teſtamento*, Gen. 14. 21. Give me the Perſons. Angl. *Donne moi les Perſonnes*, Gall. Δός μοι τούς Ἀνθρώπους. The *Seventy-two* ſo rendring the *Heb.* תֶּן לִי הַנֶּפֶשׁ *Animas Perſonas intelligit & homines captivos.* In the ſenſe נֶפֶשׁ is taken, *Gen.* 46. 15, 18, 22, 25, 26, & 27. *Exod.* 1. 5. *Chap.* 12. 4. *chap.* 15. 19. *Lev.* 5. 2. & 20. 6. *Numb.* 15. 25, 26. And many other places too long to be cited out of the Old Teſtament, in imitation whereof the New Teſtament ſo ſpeaketh: *Act.* 2. 41. & 43. *chap.* 3. 23. *chap.* 7. 14. *chap.* 27. 37. *Rom.* 2. 9. 1 *Peter* 3. 20.

The Perſons of the Clergy are compriſed in that (πᾶσα ψυχή) *let every ſoul*; their Eſtates in the *6. verſ. Render*-----*tribute to whom tribute is due.* And that you may know to whom Tribute is due, the Apoſtle telleth you, it is to him that beareth the Sword, who hath Power Civil, and Secular, *verſ.* 4.

Neither would I adviſe *Boniface* to thruſt in here ſwaggering with his two Swords; for here is not room for him, the place is deſigned for one who hath but one Sword, and who came honeſtly by it, and can give a good account thereof as he is the Miniſter of God, a terrour to thoſe that do evil, and revenger to execute wrath, not to excommunicate

nicate. In a word this place doth ſo peremptorily ſubject all Perſons to the Civil Power, that I muſt needs though ſomewhat related to the Clergy, profeſs the Text makes equal Subjection our duty; and gratitude to the favour of our Prince maketh our Exemptions (whatever they are) at once our Priviledges above our Neighbours; and our debts to our Prince.

Fourthly, The Apoſtle *St.* Paul *directeth* Titus *to preach Obedience* and Subjection due to Principalities and Magiſtrates from Chriſtians *without any exception of Perſons*, Tit. 3. 1. Nay, if you enquire who they are that *Titus muſt put in mind to be ſubject*, you cannot refer it to other than *ſuch* perſons *as* by St. *Pauls* direction *were committed to his care and teaching*, among which you will *cap.* 1. find *the Clergy-Elders*, *ver.* 5. πρεσβύτεροι, *and Biſhops*, ver. 6. ἐπίσκοποι. Theſe are ſome of thoſe whom *Titus* muſt put in mind to obey Magiſtrates. How much doth the Papal Clergy need ſuch a Monitor to cool their fervours to their Eccleſiaſtical Immunities, and to kindle their decay'd zeal for Obedience to the Civil Powers. Whence I thus reaſon, Thoſe that *Titus* is commanded to mind of their Obedience to Magiſtrates, were of right under the Government of the Magiſtrate; But Presbyters and Biſhops, *i.e.* Clergy-men were ſome of thoſe who were to be ſo minded by him: Therefore they are of Right under the Government of the Civil Magiſtrate. This is the *Theopolitia* of St. *Paul*. But leſt you ſhould doubt he had not good will enough to the Succeſſors and Clients of St. *Peter*, out of an old quarrel that fell out between him and St. *Peter*, when the Doctor of the Gentiles was ſo bold with the Prince of Apoſtles, that he did charge him with diſſimulation, a very ſmall and dwarfiſh fault in St. *Peter*, and hugely improved in his Succeſſors. Who knows whether a ſpice of this old grudg were not ſtrew'd on the injunctions of Obedience, and Subjection to the Civil Power? But what was St. *Peters* opinion in the caſe? Fourth Scripture Proof.

Fifthly, *St. Peter then in Epiſt.* 1. *chap.* 2. 13, 14, 15, 16, *verſes*, doth very unluckily for his Succeſſors and their Clergy fall into the ſame ſtrain of Subjecting the Clergy as well as others; for he *doth without exception require of all Chriſtians that they ſubmit themſelves*; i.e. their Perſons, and by conſequence their Eſtates, *to every Ordinance of Man, whether to the King, &c.* How unhappily forgetful was he of his Vicar! not one word of him and his Supremacy but all reſerved intire to the King, and Inferiour Magiſtrates ſent by the King, to whom all Chriſtians within his Dominions are to ſubmit themſelves. Fifth Scripture Proof.

But in thoſe days Chriſtians were under Perſecution, and it would not have been prudence to have publiſhed their Priviledges, and to have exempted the Clergy. It ſeems *Rome* hath long underſtood by unwritten Verities and Apoſtolical Traditions, that *Peter* thought one thing, and wrote another. But the ſpite is, he doth *ex cathedra*, determine this where certainly he is Infallible; ſince his Succeſſors in after-

ages

ages claim the Infallible Privileg in vertue of that firſt Grant made to *Peter*; who in practice did once what his Succeſſors do very often without impair of their Infallibility err *(in genere morum)* as to practice, but cannot in Doctrine. Well, ſure *Peter* did thus direct prudentially, and temporiſing! not ſo, his Reaſons do as it falls out aſſure us he did own it as a perpetual Doctrine and Rule; for 1. It is for the Lords ſake, *verſ.* 13. And this farther, 2. is the will of the Lord; and 3. that by ſo doing they might ſtop the mouths of the fooliſh and ignorant; who among the Heathens were ready to charge the Chriſtians without any ground given, with that, which on juſt reaſons from the ſeditious and rebellious practices of well-nigh a thouſand years conteſting with the Civil Supream Power, *Rome* hath given the fooliſh Hereticks to object againſt them; but in the words of Royal mouth, *Their Faith is faction, and their Religion Rebellion.*

Sixth Scripture Proof.

Now to all theſe add we in the ſixth place this Scripture-Argument; *That the Clergy whether ordinary Prieſts, or the High-Prieſts, or Prophets, once were and that (*jure*) of right ſubject to the Government of the Secular Power, and were bound to appear and give account of themſelves to the Civil Power in caſe they were accuſed and ſummoned.* So when *Abimelech* and the Prieſts that dwelt at *Nob* were accuſed and ſummoned to give account of themſelves, and what they had done for *David*; they obey and appear before *Saul* their King, 1 *Sam.* 22. 11. Who indeed did as cruelly and tyrannically adjudg them to death as they had dutifully and readily obey'd his Summons. But now ſure if there had been any Priviledg of exemption, ſome one or other among thoſe fourſcore and five Prieſts would have known it, and pleaded it before they had been ſo unmercifully Butchered; but here is not one word of all this, no exception to the Judg as incompetent, no deprivation, and degradation from the Prieſthood, in order to reduce them to the Secular and Lay-ſtate: No delivering them by the Eccleſiaſtick State into the hands of the Secular Power; in which and ſuch like formalities the *Romiſh* Prieſt (if at any time he be ſo unbefriended and unhappy) is ſtript of his Clerical Immunities, and delivered over to the Civil Sword. It is a Riddle *Rome* will hardly unfold with dexterity, that Eighty-five Prieſts ſhould have neither knowledg of ſuch a Priviledg, nor courage to plead it for ſaving their life. I need not adviſe a Seminary-Prieſt apprehended and in danger of condemnation, to ſeek a Precedent at *Nob*, he knows he ſhall loſe his labour; it is *Rome* only that ſhaves the head, and then as ſacred forbids Kings to meddle with it. Yet leſt the Tyranny of *Saul* whom the Scripture notes for this, or the meanneſs of the ſufferers ſhould any whit invalidate the inſtance, let us look a little lower where we find *Abiathar* deprived of the Prieſtly Office by *Solomon*, 1 *King.* 2. 26, 27. *Who commanded that he ſhould get him to Anathoth*, ver. 26. *and thruſt him from being Prieſt before the Lord*, ver. 27. *The chief Prieſts among*

mong the Hebrews *as they were put in by the Kings, ſo for grievous faults they might be put out, or puniſht with death by the Kings, for they were Subjects, and while the King ſat the High Prieſt ſtood.* So *Grotius* on the place.

Summi Sacerdotes apud Hebræos ut à regibus inſtituebantur; ita & ab iiſdem gravi ex culpâ deſtitui imo & morte puniri poterant. Erant enim ſubditi ideoq; ſedente Rege ſtabat ſummus Sacerdos: Hug. Grot. in loc. So *Grotius* took it for granted that *Abimelech* was High-Prieſt, to whom *Sadok* ſucceeded High-Prieſt, 1 *Chron.* 29. 22.

Now the Caſe is altered at *Rome*, and hath been long ſince. *Abiathar* came and (on his appearance) received ſentence of Judgment from his Soveraign: But *Sergius the firſt* was of a more unyielding mettal, and though the Emperour *Juſtinian the ſecond* ſent for him to *Conſtantinople*, to anſwer for his Diſobedience to his Soveraign, who required him to receive the Canons of the Council of *Trullo*; yet this Pope found Partizans among his fellow-Subjects, who had leſs manners than to obey their Emperour, and more love to the Pope than to let him take ſo dangerous a Journey, and he good man would not be ſo unkind as to go againſt the will of thoſe who offered violence to the extraordinary Purſuivant that ſummoned him. Nay men of leſs Authority have taken on them to refuſe Obedience to the Summons of their Soveraign. Thus *Thomas Becket* though a greater Saint than *Sergius*, yet of a lower rank in Power refuſed to appear before King *Henry* II. and his Council of Nobles at *Notrhampton*. Nor was *Anſelm*'s carriage much more dutiful to his Soveraign King *Henry* I. to whom he refuſed to do Homage as was required and had been performed by his Predeceſſors.

An. Dom. 688.

Zacharias Pro. to Spatharius.

Anno 1164, or there abouts.

Anno 1103.

By theſe Inſtances it appears that both ordinary Prieſts, nay the High-Prieſt himſelf among the *Jews*, were under the coercive Government of the Kings of *Iſrael*, whoſe Authority the Prophets, though by extraordinary call they may with reaſon be thought in ſome reſpect above the High-Prieſt, ſubmitted unto without appeal to a Superiour, or exception to the incompetency of their Judgment. So did the Prophet ſubmit to *Aſa*, 2 *Chron.* 16. 10. and patiently did bear the haſty judgment of his angry Soveraign; no noiſe here of an appeal, no mention made of Immunities, of his Office, or Priviledg of the Clergy. The Seer doth not (what once the Servant of *Philip* the *Macedonian* King did) appeal from *Aſa* a good King in a bad humour, to *Aſa* a better Judg in a good humour. How would an *Anſelm*, a *Becket*, a *Brandelino Valdemarino*, or *Scipio Saraceno* have huſt and hector'd his Prince for ſuch uſage as *Hanani* from *Aſa*, or *Jeremiah* from *Zedekiah* and his Princes, *Jer.* 38 5. 6. found. But thoſe great Clerks (ſo let me call the Prophets) pretended to no ſuch exemption in thoſe days, and yet *Jeremiah* had ſo ample commiſſion that the Pope deſireth no more to be granted him of Kings and Princes, and thinks this enough to ſet him above them all whileſt he offers a violence to that Text, (*Jer.* 1. 10. *I have ſet thee over the Nations, and over the Kingdoms of the Earth.*) Great as the violence he offers

to the Emperours Crown and Soveraign Dignity. But it admits a plea whether to his excuſe in part or to his greater ſhame, let the Impartial Judg without violence to both the Text and Princes, he had loſt his longing, for neither do freely grant the Popes that Supremacy they muſt have, or they miſcarry, though I think it was not the denial hereof was the cauſe of the miſcarriage of the Female Pope; though both mother and brat too (I do gueſs, for I find not a word of this Popes Nieces or Nephews) died in the Child-bearing: Yet be it or better or worſe for our own Clergy, or the ſhavelings of *Rome*; the Secular Authority did once govern the Clergy in the Church of the *Jews*; and ordinary Prieſts, the High-Prieſt and Prophets themſelves ſubmitted to it; whence our obedient and learned Clergy have example to their dutifulneſs, and the Papal Clergy a reproof of their diſloyalty; and our *Theſis* hath a good evidence of its truth; which I ſhall now endeavour to prove by ſome farther Reaſons (though I think enough to make out the truth hath been already delivered) perhaps Reaſon may convince ſome who are not willing to ſee the truth in Scripture-precedents.

Pope *Joan*, who was call'd *John* the 3*d*. a ſtory avow'd by more than fifty Authors of the Popiſh Religion, as Dr. *Prideaux*, and *Blondell* witneſs.

Reaſ. 1. The Clergy are ſubject to the Government Secular, or elſe one of theſe two things will follow, *viz.*

1. *Either each Clergy-man is a Soveraign*, and under no Law and Government, *which no ſober man ever yet dreamt of*, for this were to make every of them a God, or a King: Or elſe,

Staniſlaus Orichorius affirms that a common Prieſt is as much better than a King, as a Man is better than a Beaſt. *Chimera* p. 97. a.

2. *That they are by a Subordination of Perſons of their own profeſſion, Subjects and Vaſſals to a Supream Eccleſiaſtical Independent*, or abſolute *Power without, or above, or againſt the Civil Power*; which as no Loyal heart would wiſh, ſo no Royal Crowned head ſhould endure; for ſuch conſiderations as I ſhall now offer to the Readers conſideration.

1. *This were to make either a native ſubject equal to his Soveraign Prince, or to render a conſiderable body of his People Subjects to a forreigner*; which appears thus: If the body of the Clergy (and the orders of the profeſſed Religious) be only ſubject and under the ſole Government of one of their own Profeſſion; and whoever is a native this perſon is, and his Succeſſors will be (when advanced to the Supremacy and Eccleſiaſtical Soveraignty) ſet up in a power Independent on his Prince, and uncontroulable by his Prince, and ſo of a ſubject be made a Soveraign over the Clergy, whoſe obedience will be withdrawn from the Prince to the Eccleſiaſtical head, and Supream; or, If this Perſon, who is ſuppoſed Eccleſiaſtical Soveraign, and who ought to govern the Religious and the Clergy, be a forreigner, then he that by birth and blood is a ſtranger to the Prince becomes by this means the Lord and Soveraign over the

the whole body of the Clergy and Religious, which in many Countrys is no ſmall part of the people,

In *England* I believe it was well-nigh one third Prieſts

Religious; King *James* obſerves it in his Apology. *unum Galliæ Regnum habet ultra* 300000. *hominum millia quæ ſub obtentu clericatus, monachatus, functioniſque Eccleſiaſticæ jugum Regis excuſſerunt.* P. Molin. De Monach. Temp. Pontif. Roman. c. 18.

2. *This would leſſen all the Princes and Soveraigns of the world in three things eſſential to the very being and ſtability, as well as to the Glory and Grandeur of their Kingly Thrones and Majeſty*; It would leſſen *their Freedom and liberty in making Laws for their whole Kingdom*, and ere they can reſolve on that Ordinance which they do apprehend will be for univerſal good of their Kingdom, they muſt enquire of the Eccleſiaſtical Exempts whether ſuch a Law would not violate the Eccleſiaſtical liberty, and ask them leave to make it, or elſe they ſhall be taught as *Anſelm* and *Becket* would teach their Soveraigns, or as *Paul* the fifth taught the Duke of *Savoy*, and the State of *Genoua*, and would fain have taught the State of *Venice*, but they proved ſtubborn Scholars, and enforced that preſuming tutor to forgo the Lecture.

Next *it would leſſen their Authority in commanding obedience to Laws made*; the Exempt Clergy would undoubtedly firſt conſider, whether the Obedience required were not an infraction of their Immunities, and how far it intrenched on the liberty of the Church, and when this is brought to an iſſue who does not ſee that the General priviledge pretended untieth the (*Vinculum neceſſariæ & debitæ obſervantiæ*) bond of a neceſſary Obedience which is due of Right to the Magiſtrate, and leaves the Exempt to the free determination, whether of good nature and voluntary choice he will comply with his Prince, or whether Prudence will not rather determine to ſecure their pretended Priviledg, and deny that to their Prince, which (they pretend) he hath no right to command. At moſt by this means Obedience which by God and Nature is made the Prince his due, and the Clergy-mans debts is by a fraudulent pretext reduced to an uncertain and arbitrary benevolence. Here hence will enſue, *The leſſening of the Power which ſhould execute Laws made, and which ſhould ſupport the Power in executing of them.* How feeble is a Precarious Power? It is next to none which is but ſo much as the good nature of one like to ſuffer or be reſtrained by it, will allow it to be. All this I have ſaid is evident from an undeniable inſtance of *Paul 5th.* who better informed, or bolder reſolved, told the *Venetians. He would not endure them to judg Eccleſiaſtical Perſons who are not Subjects unto Princes, and whom they cannot chaſtiſe though they be Rebellious.* By this Princes may ſee how little Power that Indulgent Father the Pope

Tenentur Clerici obligatione non coactivâ ſed directivâ. Bellarm. de Clerici c. 28.

Almoſt the third part of their Subjects and of their Territories is Church-men, and Church-livings. K. *Jam.* Epiſt. to *Frat Princes*, p. 21. Hiſtory of the Quarrels between P. *P. 5th* and *Venetians*.

Anno 1605. *Paul 5th.* envying the Soveraign Authority that was given to the *Venetians* by God, Nature, and the liberality of Emperours and Popes, as ſoon as he had aſſumed the Papacy he began to ſearch out for ways to ſubvert it. *Il Cardinal.* part. 2. lib. 1. pag. 127.

would leave in their hands, who in Criminal caſes of higheſt nature will ſo boldly deny them all power to judg Eccleſiaſticks. Certainly by the ſame juſtice he taketh away power of judging by Laws Civil, he will alſo (when time ſerveth, and with equal right) deny them a power to make Laws to regulate the Obedience of the Eccleſiaſticks, or if there be ſome daring Prince will venture to make the Law, the Pope, or who-ever ſhall be ſuppos'd the abſolute Soveraign over the Clergy, ſhall by the injured Clergy have timely notice to interpoſe a Prohibition that the Obedience be not exacted, nor a non-Obedience to ſuch Laws puniſht. And what will remain to ſuch a Prince but a Title and Name, leſſened to ſuch a degree, That he muſt owe the Peace of his Kingdom, the Reverence of his Royal Dignity, the Safety of his Perſon, and the Succeſſion of his Poſterity to the arbitrary will of every Clergy-man, or at leaſt of the Eccleſiaſtical Prince.

2. *Reaſ.* They that are by the Word of God bound to pray *for the Secular Prince as for a Soveraign under whoſe Power and Authority they do live and enjoy the quiet and proſperity of their life, are certainly under the Government of the Secular Prince, both as to their Perſons or Bodies, and as to their Eſtates or Goods, which have no ſmall ſhare in the peace and quiet that they ſhould deſire to enjoy.* I think little doubt can be made of this Propoſition, or any thing contained in it; for it ſpeaketh not of Prayers which (*ex debito Charitatis*) out of Chriſtian charity we ought to make for all men, and ſpecially for men in great Power who through a juſt favour may much advantage the Church of God. But we ſpeak of Prayers that are to be made for particular Rulers under whom we either were born, or by Gods over-ruling Providence are for preſent determined. Now the Scripture doth thus direct, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. *I exhort therefore* (ſaith St. *Paul*) *that firſt of all Supplications, &c. be made for all men, for Kings, &c.* * In which words you have a Canon of the Apoſtle directing and commanding *Timothy*, and in him obliging Biſhops to pray for all, for Kings and all in †Authority over us, that under their Government our life may be peaceable and quiet to our ſelves, whileſt our Perſons are defended from violence of the cruel, and our Eſtates are defended from the injuries of oppreſſors. Which certainly is a benefit as we enjoy in the place of our abode, ſo by the Government of the place where we abide: And this ſeems to be compriſed in that of (*Euſebius* * citing) *Dionyſius, without ceaſing we pray for your Kingdom that it may abide unſhaken*, in the ſtability whereof our affairs will abide ſtable and ſafe. Now who ſees not that this needs muſt be in that State or Kingdom where thoſe live who are bound thus to Pray?

* παρακαλῶ, &c. *Sicut Imperatores Romani mandata dare præſidibus ſolebant, ita Paulus in Timotheo mandata dat Epiſcopis*, Hug. Grot. in loc.

† Jer. 27. 17, 18. commands the Prieſts to ſubmit to the Government of the King of *Babylon*, and he enjoyns them to pray for the Government and Governors, *c.* 29. *v.* 1. and 7*th*. So that put theſe together they make up the Proof that Clergy are bound to pray for the Civil Government as that they ought to ſubmit their necks to.

* Δι᾽ ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας ἀνθρώπων ὅπως δοθείσης ὑμῖν παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ διαμένῃ, προσευχόμεθα.

This

This Text then requireth thoſe that pray to look on thoſe Kings and Magiſtrates which in the Apoſtles words are βασιλεῖς ἢ ὑπερεχόντας for whom they pray, as Kings over them, as their Rulers, and ſo conſequently they muſt acknowledg themſelves the Ruled or Subjects, according to the rule, That Relates do mutually ſuppoſe each other. In a word or two that the Clergy muſt pray for Kings, and for thoſe that are in Authority, is certain enough from the comprehenſive words of the Text. But for what Kings, &c. if for forreign, how much more for their own? If for their own then is it only that they may give good counſels, and by them direct the Clergy? This hath very little availed with reſolute and turbulent Clergy-men, and can as little contribute to quieting the life of the diſturbed as it can reſtrain, puniſh, and by coercive Power chaſtiſe the diſturbers, which if it be (by an ill chance as often it hath been) found to proceed from the Clergy, alas the Prince is left helpleſs, and the Laity is left hopeleſs. And we had need to have another manner of addreſs, *viz.* That all Men and Kings, and all in Authority ſhould pray for the Clergy, that they may be good-natur'd, wiſe and thankful to God for their Immunities, that they may abuſe none of their Immunities to the diſturbance of the Prince or Laity, and ſo had we need the Text be changed. *Relata ſe invicem ponunt.*

Reaſ. 3. The Clergy are bound to give an Exemplary Obedience and Fidelity to their King, that by their Example the People who are committed to them for Inſtruction may be induced to and ſetled in their Obedience and Allegiance; but ſuch an Example is not given, but rather a contrary example of diſobedience, diſreſpect, and contumacy, by a pretended exemption of the Clergy; they are not then exempt, but ought to be in body and ſtate, or goods under the Civil Government. Thus briefly, they that by God are commanded to give Exemplary Obedience to Civil Government, are as to their Perſons and Goods under the Civil Government; But the Clergy are ſo commanded: Therefore they are under it. The Major Propoſition can admit no doubt; for ſuch a command from God makes our Obedience due to ſuch a Government; the only diſpute can be whether God hath commanded the Clergy to give example of ſuch Obedience now? Thus I prove it; God commands them Exemplary doing what is to be done for the Lords ſake, and what is to be done for Conſcience ſake; the Clergy more than others are bound by their Profeſſion to let the World know that they are Conſcientious, and that they act for the Lords ſake: But now Obedience to Civil Magiſtrates is ſo commanded for the Lords ſake, 1 *Pet.* 2.13. and it is commanded for Conſcience too, *Rom.* 13.5. That the Clergy are comprehended in thoſe general commands, as I have already proved, ſo now I ſay to confirm it, That where the Scripture doth not, they cannot except themſelves.

Obedience to the Civil Government is every-where but at *Rome*, and in her appendant Schools a Moral vertue, and a neceſſary Ingredient to make

make an honeſt and vertuous man. And therefore the Loyal Moraliſts, the wiſe Law-givers, with beſt warrant of Reaſon and Religion always required it in all Subjects, only *Rome*, (where it matters not how much blind obedience to the Pope, or how little Religion toward God they find in their Clergy), taketh care that their Clergy be not mancipated to the ſtrict Rules of Political vertues, leſt of good Citizens and obedient Subjects, they ſhould inſenſibly lapſe into a differviceableneſs to the Papal Tyranny. But we muſt, guided by Reaſon and Scripture, acknowledg Allegiance a very great vertue, wherein (as in other vertues) the Reformed Clergy are bound to be Enſamples to their flocks.

Reaſ. 4. *They who do defend their Perſons and their Goods by the Authority and Power of the Civil Government, ought in all equity and reaſon to bear and profeſs true Allegiance to the Governours and Government.* The right which is done for them in ſuch caſes obligeth them to this duty, and the benefit from Governours to the Governed is a moſt juſt reaſon for Obedience from the Subject to the Prince. The Apoſtle St. *Peter* intimates this as one ground of Obedience. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14. *Be ye ſubject, &c.* Why? *becauſe Governours are* εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, appointed to reſtrain the injurious, and oppreſſive by judging, condemning and puniſhing their injuſtice. They are alſo εἰς ἔπαινον ἀγαθοποιῶν, *for the praiſe of thoſe that do well*; Protecting, rewarding, and praiſing them. The benefit we enjoy ſhould in reaſon bind us to the obedience and ſubmiſſion we owe our Governours.

By this Argument St. *Paul* preſt the Chriſtians at *Rome* to Obedience, *Rom.* 13. 3. For *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil, &c. Do good and thou ſhalt have praiſe of the ſame*, ſo verſ. 4th. *The Ruler is the Miniſter of God for good*, &c. therefore *be ye ſubject.* And this is the Prophets reaſon. *Pray for the Peace of the City*, &c. But it's *Babilon*; true, *but in the Peace thereof you ſhall enjoy peace*, Jer. 29. 1. with *ver.* 7. So then the Argument holds good in the Prophets and Apoſtles Logick; They who enjoy the benefits of a Government muſt be obedient to the Government. And I would fain know what will become of all the pleas which the *Romaniſts* make for the Preheminence of Clergy-men, if this foundation be not ſolid and good; the great benefits the Laity reap from the counſel and labours of the Clergy, they judg reaſon enough for the Laity's Subjection to them. In a word to ſpeak Reaſon with Impartiality in the caſe, Let thoſe that are benefited, be ſubmiſſive to and obſervant of thoſe by whom they are benefited, then the common people & all the Laity will duly obſerve in Spiritual caſes the counſel & authority of their Spiritual Guides, and the Clergy in Civil and Secular Caſes will be left where Chriſt and St. *Peter* did leave them under the Civil and Secular Prince to be governed by him. There is indeed a diſpute whether the Right of Governing be originally in the Benefactor, becauſe of the Benefit he beſtows, or on ſome other account; but there is no diſpute, nor will it admit any, whether the

Beneficia conferunt jus & poteſtatem Benefactori.

Bene-

Beneficiary be bound to his Benefactor, and ought for that very cause to observe and obey him.

Beneficia sunt argumenta juris postulandi, hominesq; ad officium jure debitum commovendi.

Fifthly, *What Priviledges and exemptions for their Persons or Estates, from common or publick burthens and services the Clergy do enjoy, they do enjoy through the favour of their Prince or Governour, who pleaseth to remit to them, what there may be some reason to perswade, but no Law, or Right to command from the Prince:* Who as at first he saw Reason to grant that favour, so will (I believe) continue it until he see a sufficient cause to recal his own Grant; which future cause may (by conjecture from what already hath been acted in our view) sooneſt arise from an usurping Ingratitude (the hereditary infirmity of the Papal See) which never giveth to any, what it can by fraud or force keep to it self: as the Grave and Impartial Author of the Council of Trent well observeth, on the Pompatick and Ridiculous Act of *Paul* the Fourth, giving the Kingly Title over *Ireland* to Queen *Mary*, who had derived it from her Father, and her Brother, and had assumed it to her self at her first coming to the Crown. Such Legerdemain hath long past at *Rome*, coined with the impress of gratitude or bounty, and when it hath cheated Kings and Princes, into a degree that awakens their resentments and just indignation; they will resume the exorbitant Grants of Priviledges, and teach the Papal Clergy to use more manners, and acknowledg that none of their Immunities granted by Princes, were intended to make them Princes fellows, or Rebels against them without guilt, or fear of answering at their Secular Judicatures. And when this shall come to pass, the Christian World shall understand the mistake of the Canonists in their Law; which assert, *That the Clergy, and all their Goods, are by Divine right free from the Power of Secular Princes.* Against which I shall now oppose no other Authority than the Concession of *Bellarmine*, one, as any other, able to say as much for, and as resolved to yield no more than he must needs in the Cause of the Ecclesiastick liberty; who confesseth (*lib. de clericis. c. 28.*) *That not one word can be produced from the Word of God, by which this exemption of the Clergy can be proved.* And therefore hence I shall briefly argue. They who owe their exemption of Body and Goods from Personal services and tribute to the Power of their Secular Prince; though by such favour they are actually free, yet originally they were subject to him, and of Right they still are: and if the Prince see cause to require it of them, they are bound to serve him with their Bodies and Estates, which is certainly to be under their Government. What the favour of the Prince granted once to any of his Subjects is as encouragement to their obedience, not as security to their disobedience, granted and it must be for common good: but when once it

Illud hercle pontificibus in more positum, de alieno corio ludere, & quod justis dominis auferre nequeunt, id ipsis elargiri. Histor. Conc. Trident. l. 5.

Clerici rebellio in Regem non est crimen læsæ majestatis, quia non est subditus Regi. Em. Sa. *Aphoris. confessariorum in voce clericus.* Edit. Antwop. Et Colon.

Clerici non possunt a judice politico puniri vel ullo modo trahi ad secularis magistratus tribunal. Bell. *de cler. c. 28.*

Clerici & eorum bona omnia jure divino libera sunt a potestate secularium principum.

Bona clericorum sunt & merito debent esse ab omnibus Principum terrenorum tributis libera, at exemptio ista humano jure non divino introducta est, prop. 5. *propositione. 4.*

proveth

proveth a Universal, Publick inconvenience or mischief it ought to be reversed. Now Ecclesiastick Persons do owe their Immunities from personal Services and Tributes to the favour of their Secular Prince: Therefore their Persons and Goods are under their Government. If this do not appear evident, I would have a Papist tell me; What had been the Case of the Clergy, if such Immunities had never been Granted? Had they not been under the Civil Magistrate? What if necessity awaken the Civil Magistrate, and he seeth in point of prudence and safety, that these Exemptions and Immunities may not be continued, and so by a Law revokes them, Doth not the Clergy thereby return to their pristine Subjection? Ecclesiastical Immunities for the Bodies and Goods of the Ecclesiasticks are introduced, *Jure humano*, by the Law of Man; if no such Law had been made, or on just cause hereafter shall be repeal'd, no such Exemption had ever been, or else had been null'd though once granted; if no such Exemption had been granted, then had these Ecclesiasticks been equally subject with the non-exempt, and as much bound to obey the Civil Government as the Lays.

Sixthly, *The Clergy as such are in the essential constitution of their Office, and as to the Immunities that are necessarily appendant to it, or flowing from it, wholly of a different nature*, viz. *Spiritual*; *and therefore cannot in Reason claim Immunities which are in their nature Secular and Civil:* Such are these we have been discoursing of. Now, every one may soon know, that the Priviledges of every rank of men, are suitable to the Nature of that Office or Relation wherein they stand; so Civil Offices have the Immunities which are Civil, and Spiritual Offices are invested with Spiritual Immunities; as it is not a Priviledg due to a Christian as Christian, to be exempt from the Coercive Power of the Civil Magistrate; so neither is the Priviledg of the Clergy by vertue of their Office so great as to advance them above the Power of the Prince: God who knew what Priviledges were fittest for each Order of men, would sure have told us that the Clergy should be free from the Government of the Civil Magistrate, if he had either made or intended an Exemption in all Civil Cases should be a Priviledg to Ecclesiastick Persons. But *Bellarmine* himself confesseth, that there is not one Word of God proving such Immunities due tō the Clergy. It were a great disorder, and would bring in a confusion upon the Universe to allow such a mixture; for why is not the Irrational creature raised to the Priviledges of the Humane Nature? What answer would a Shaveling give me to the question? Or why is the Humane Nature determined to a Satisfaction, with Priviledges below the Angelical? Is it not because their Natures are different? Well, why is this a satisfactory account of different Priviledges in different Ranks of Natural Beings, and may not be alike satisfactory, in the different kinds of Moral and Political Beings and Orders? These are as different as the other. It were a monstrous birth should a bruit bring forth somewhat half bruit and half

Lib. de clericis cap. 28. Nullum potest proferri verbum Dei quo ista exemptio confirmetur.

half Man, and I do not yet see any less than monster in this; that the Indelible Characters of Priesthood should stamp a Licence of Immunities in Secular affairs: Such mishapen births *Rome* may perhaps little wonder at and foster, but we must do with them as our Laws, enquire out the offender, and condemn all that are proved guilty: So may the Fathers of this mishapen brat speed when-ever they are taken in their Treasons, on the confidence that their Indelible Character protects them from the stroke of the Secular Sword.

Rome hath perverted the order of Government and made the Temporal submit to the Spiritual, contrary to the custom of so many ages. *Il Nipotis. di Roma. p. 4.*

7. Reas. *They who were born Native Subjects, and by Priesthood or Orders, enter not on any Relation that doth necessarily and justifiably abolish that former Relation; these though so ordained, remain Subjects to their Natural Prince, and owe him obedience still.* This Proposition surely none in their wits will deny; for the Native Subject is both as to Person and Estate under the Government of his Native Prince, and continues so until somewhat do *(jure)* by right, not only *(ex consequenti)* by consequence, abolish that primeval bond, which with his swadling bands, Nature and God put upon him. Now then, one of these two must be asserted by the exempt Clergy:

1. Either that they were never born Subjects, and so were in different sense from the Apostle born free. If they like not this, say

2. Or else though born Subjects, their Holy Orders have nulled that natural Allegiance, and defeated the Prince of so many Subjects as have been made Clerks. If this be the Case,

unum Gallia regnum habet ultra trecenta hominum millia quæ subjacent clericatus & monachatus functioni, Ecclesiastica jugum Regis excussérunt, aliumq; a Rege summum Principem agnoscunt non modò in Spiritualibus sed & in Temporalibus. P. du Moul. de Temp. Monar. P. I. cap. 18.

I would enquire whence is this corroding quality in the Indelible Character, to eat out what is engraven so deep in our Natures by the God of Order and Nature? Certainly Christ and his Apostles never so tempered it: But *Rome* who found the bonds of Allegiance were fetters on them, restraining them from their resolved Usurpations, and hindring their growing Ambition, resolve what-ever comes on't; These Bonds must be broken, and these Cords must be cast off (to allude to that, *Psal. 2.*) and it must be done by some curious engine too, for else the noise of it would give an Allarm. In one word, The Grace of God in Christ to his Church, hath been so far from abolishing any, that it hath mightily fortified on all the bonds of Natural and just necessary Relations, in all sorts of men, Civil, and Sacred, and commands Ecclesiastical Persons as well as Civil, to observe the just Laws of those Princes, to whom Nature had before made them Subjects. It is not Christ's Canon, but the Canon of Antichrist, which to make good Clerks spoils good Citizens. Had the truth in this been as consistent with Papal designs, as the distinct duties of a good Subject, and Sa-

cred Perſon are conſiſtent in one Perſon, I had neither troubled you and my ſelf, nor had they troubled the World with this Controverſy; It were time for Princes to command no more Prieſts ſhould be made, until *Rome*, or who elſe do pretend the ſame Prerogative, had learnt to preſerve a Loyal and good Citizen, while they make an Eccleſiaſtical Officer: might my motion be heard, they only ſhould confer Orders on Subjects who had learnt this skill.

Eighthly, *And laſtly, were this a Truth*, That the Clergy were both as to Bodies and Eſtates not under the Government of the Civil Magiſtrate, *How could the Primitive Chriſtians, the Martyred Biſhops, the perſecuted Clergy, avow it to the World, that Chriſtianity did not teach any thing deſtructive or dangerous to Commonwealths and Civil Governments?* How great an impudence would it be in it ſelf to deny? Or how greatly would it have been to the ſhame of the ſuffering Chriſtians, if that their adverſaries could charge on them, that they profeſſed a Religion which directly ſpoil'd the Magiſtrate of his Coercive Power over their Prieſts, and *Indirectly, i. e. in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, in relation to ſpirituals, ſpoiled him of his Coercive Power over the reſt of his Subjects. *Julian's Sarcaſme* had been but a Retaliation to them, if they had been ſo principled and perſwaded. Might he not with ſome colour of Reaſon, plead, You have ſpoil'd me of Supreme Authority over Sacred Perſons their Bodies and Eſtates, as too Holy to be commanded by the polluted hands of Secular Princes: And I judg the Perſons of Prieſts and Chriſtians too Holy to meddle with the polluting things of this World, and will, *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, free them from thoſe cares and buſineſſes? Had there been a proof made before any one Tribunal of the *Roman* Emperours, that the Chriſtian Religion had publiſhed, maintained, and practiſed ſuch a Propoſition; the impartial World would ſoon have pull'd off the mask, and ſhew'd undeniably that thoſe pretended Martyrs were not condemned for the profeſſion of their ſpeculative opinions, or the owning of the Truth of the Hiſtory of Chriſt: but that theſe pretended Martyrs were real and avowed Traytors, enemies to *Ceſar*, to the Civil Government, and dangerous uſurpers on the Supreme Authority of the Prince. Such Martyrs indeed may now be talkt of in *Rome*; but what impartial Judg will not condemn the Treaſonableneſs of the crime which deſerved, and the Impudence of the Plea which defends the ſufferers, who died for diſloyal rejection of their Native Prince, and traiterous ſubjecting themſelves to the Power of a Forreigner, enemy to him in whoſe Kingdom they do flouriſh or might flouriſh?

He derided the Chriſtians he rob'd with this ſcoff, that he would make their journey to Heaven more expedite and eaſie.

Now after ſo much Reaſon pleaded for the ſubjection of the Clergy in Civil Cauſes to the Civil Magiſtrate, it may perhaps ſeem to ſome incredible, that any Doctrine by any Doctor ſhould be avowed contrary hereunto; can there be ſuch an unreaſonable opinion entertain'd, or maintained by any? *The next thing propoſed for to be treated, will plain enough*

enough ſhew both who are the Teachers, and what is that they Teach in this point: Wherein I will be brief, and but name particulars. *The Church of* Rome *hath* (excepting ſome few) *in all places where they durſt all barefaced owned this, and ſtrongly conteſted for it:* That neither the Goods nor the Perſons of their Clergy, or Religious, were under any Coact ive Power of the Civil Magiſtrate. Indeed ſome Perſons of the Roman Communion as Loyal, as Learned, do diſclaim ſuch exemptions and Immunities, content with the favour of their Sovereign; to whom they are ready to acknowledg they owe their Immunities whatever they are, above the Immunities that their fellow-Subjects enjoy for their Perſons or Goods: Nay, whole Churches and Seignories that we rightly account Popiſh, as the *French*, the *Venetians*, do accord with the Proteſtant Churches, in the juſt oppoſition of ſuch unlimited and abſolute Immunities for the Clergy, and maintain the Sovereign Authority of the Prince over the Perſons and Eſtates of the Eccleſiaſticks. Or in the Words of a Perſon of Honour who hath lately ſpoken to this caſe on the by. *God be thanked that ſenſleſs Uſurpation and exemption of the Clergy from the common Juſtice of Nations, is pretty well out of countenance, and ſince the Republick of* Venice *ſo notoriouſly baffled* Paul *the fifth in that very point; other Kings and Princes have chaſtiſed their own Clergy for tranſcendent Crimes, without asking leave of his Holineſs, or treating them in any other manner than they do their ordinary malefactors.* This is the Caſe now, but time was when the Pope and the Clergy would not ſo eaſily have forgone their Uſurpations, and Princes how great ſoever, ſhould have hardly exerciſed ſuch an undoubted Right: And time will come again (if ever the Pope can attain to a Power that may encourage him to revive his pretended Right) when he will exempt the Clergy from the juriſdiction of Secular Princes, and reſume all the Cauſes which concern the Perſons or Eſtates of Clergymen into his own hand, and determine them as proper only for his Cogniſance. Nor do I ſurmiſe more than I have ground for; it was ſome ages paſt, the humour of the Pope and his adherents, and ſtill is their aim, as will be evident to thoſe who can and will conſult at leiſure.

3. General Who they are that exempt the Clergy from the Government of Secular Princes.

The Church of *Rome* generally.

Animadverſions upon Fanaticiſm Fanatically imputed, &c. by Dr. *St.* And the imputation refuted and retorted, by *S. C.* p. 143. and 144.

A common Prieſt is as much better than a King, as a Man is better than a Beaſt: Nay, as much as God Almighty doth excel a Prieſt, ſo much doth a Prieſt excel a King. *Stanislaus Orichovius in chimerâ. fol.* 97. cited by *H. Fowlis*, p. 37.

Firſt, *The treatiſes of ſome modern Jeſuits excellent Schollars, yet ſworn ſupporters of the Popedome*, and very zealous ſticklers for the Immunities of the Clergy; as reſolute Souldiers who defend the outworks, for the greater ſafeguard of the City. *So Bellarmine in his Book de clericis*, avows, The Clergy by Divine Right, free from the Authority of the Secular Princes. And *Emanuel Sa. tells you* what he thought in the Caſe, when he gives you a *Jeſuitical i. e. an impudent and treaſonable Reaſon*, why a Clergy-Man cannot be guilty of Treaſon: *viz.* Becauſe

the Clergy-Man is not the Prince his Subject. So in the *Colen* and *Antwerp* editions of his Book.

Aphorism. confessariorum in voce clericus. Edit. Colonienſ. & Antwerp.

Secondly, *The Constitutions of some Councils; nor is it to be wondered at*, that *since Popes got usurped Power in their hands*, they can by the Ecclesiastical Diet assume what Immunities may for future establish their Hierarchy, and confirm what hath been usurped with much profit and advantage to their Church and Cause.

Thirdly, *The Decretals of Popes* (which is as valid an Authority, as the Ordinance of a Prosperous Rebel, determining himself and his confederates Innocent Persons and Loyal Subjects) and their Bulls, among which that of *Paul* the Fifth against the Duke and Republick of *Venice*, as it is late so may suffice, being backt with Nine or Ten Precedents of other Popes, in like Cases. *Whereas of late it came to our ear, that the Duke and Council of* Venice *have enacted divers Decrees contrary to the Liberty and Immunity Ecclesiastick, and repugnant to the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and to the Constitutions of the Roman Popes.--- And the said Duke and Council have Imprisoned and detained in Prison*, Scipio Sarracenus, *and* Brandelino Valdemarino, *Persons in Ecclesiastick dignity, for certain Crimes by them committed: All which is done with pretence, that it was lawful for them (Duke and Senate) to do these things.*

Superioribus mensibus ad nostram & Apostolicæ sedis audientiam pervenit Ducem & Senatum Reipublicæ Venetorum---- diversa decreta ---- Ecclesiasticæ libertati ac immunitati contraria, tum Generalibus Concillis & sacris canonibus, nec non Romanorum Pontificum constitutionibus repugnantia statuisse ---- Eosdem Ducem & Senatum.

Et Senatum Scipionem Sarracenum Canonicum Vicentinum & Brandalinum Valdemarinum Forojulienſem Abbatem ---- Personam in dignitate Ecclesiastică constitutum ob quædam crimina---- commissa cancri mancipasse & mancipatos detinuisse sub prætextu quod eis hæc facere liceret.

Here you have the Act of the Illustrious Duke and State secretly traduced as an unjustifiable Act, and the Power (by which they do it), represented to the World as an Usurpation prejudicial to the Church-exemptions. The Crimes of the Persons were notoriously foul, especially of the Abbot, *viz.* Sorcery, Rapes, Incest, and many Murthers which the Papal softness terms, *certain pretended crimes (as was reported) by them committed*, for which, as well they deserved, they were Imprison'd: But *The Premisses being prejudicial to the Rights of the Apostolical See, and to our Authority* (saith *Pope Paul the Fifth*) *and to the Priviledges of the Persons Ecclesiastick, and for that they overthrow the Liberty and Immunity of the Church.*

Quædam prætensa crimina---- per illos ut dicebatur---- commissa.

Cumq; præmissa---- sedi Apostolicæ, nostræ Autoritati, & Ecclesiarum Juribus, & Ecclesiasticarum personarum privilegiis præjudicium inferant, ipsamq; libertatem & immunitatem Ecclesiasticam tollant.

His Holiness good man! could not bear it, and therefore after much ado he comes to tell us what he will do, and with what good examples and

and warrant for it in these words, and with the great names of Ten Popes. *We who by no means ought to endure that the Ecclesiastical Liberty and Immunity, or our Authority and the Authority of the Apostolick See should be violated and contemned, following the example of most General Councils, and of fresh memory the examples of* &c. *And other Popes our Predecessours, who have revoked the like Statutes publish't against the Ecclesiastick Liberty, as Statutes which in justice were Null, Invalid and not Ratified, and who have decreed and declared that they were Null, Invalid, and of no force.*

Nos qui nullo Pacto ferre debemus ut Ecclesiastica libertas & Immunitas, nostraq; & sedis Apostolicæ Autoritas violetur & contemnatur, Inhærentes plurimorum Generalium Conciliorum decretis, ac vestigiis *Rt. Mt. Innocent.* 3. *Honorii.* 3. *Gregorii.* 9. *Alexand.* 4. *Clem.* 4. *Martini.* 4. *Bonif.* 7. & 9. *Martini.* 5. *Nicolai.* 5. Et Aliorum *R. P.* prædecessorum Nostrorum qui similia Statuta alias contra libertatem Ecclesiasticam edita tanquam ipso jure nulla, invalida & irrita revocarunt, ac nulla invalida & irrita decreverunt & declararunt. ———

In a little Paragraph you see how much less the Pope makes of the Authority of free Princes, and how he doth pronounce that his Predecessours and General Councils have in like Cases asserted the Ecclesiastical Immunities; and a Sovereign Prince may not punish Rapes, and Murthers in a Person who is dignified with the Orders of the Church; if he doth, though they are Nullities in themselves, they shall be (as in this case they were) declared a-new from *Rome* Nullities. *On Mature deliberation with our venerable Brethren the Cardinals of the Holy Church of* Rome, *with their consent and Council, (though the foresaid Decrees, Edicts, and Commands, were in Law it self Null, Invalid, and Void) by these Presents we do decree and declare notwithstanding a-new, that they were and are Null, Invalid, and Void, of no force or moment; And that none are bound to the observing of them.*

Habitâ cum venerabilibus fratribus nostris *S. R. E.* Cardinalibus maturâ consultatione de ipsorum consilio & assensu (licet supradicta decreta & edicta, & Mandata ipso jure nulla, invalida, & irrita sint) ea nihilominus ipso jure adhuc de novo nulla, invalida & irrita, nulliusq; roboris & momenti fuisse & esse & neminem ad illorum observantiam teneri per præsentes decernimus & declaramus.

Excellently spoken! and like the Successor of an humble Fisherman! Though the Duke of *Venice* may marry the *Adriatick* without a license from *Rome*, He may not imprison a murtherous Abbot without the hazard of losing his Principality; Who would not wish to be a Denison of *Rome*, if a Conclave of the Purple Fathers may reverse a Law which was made to restrein the enormous violences of Clergymen? Compassionate Fathers that prefer the safety of their single Sons to the safety of whole Kingdoms!

By this you see Jesuites, Cardinals, the Consistory, the Popes successively, and General Councils (if there be truth in the Pope's Bull)

Synodus seculares Principes admo-

nuit ——— nec permissuros ut officiales ——— Ecclesiæ & personarum Ecclesiasticarum Immunitatem violent &c. Concil. Trident. Sess. 25. cap. 20.

ex-

exempt the Clergy from the Coactive Power of a Civil Magistrate against Nature, Reason, and Religion. How far they would allow the Directive Power if time favoured them, I give you leave to guess from the late instance of Pope *Urban*, 1632. and Pope Innocent the Tenth; This latter interposing between the French King, requiring Cardinal *de Retz* to renounce his Title or pretence to the Archbishoprick of *Paris*, reviving the old Maxime, *That Princes ought not to be suffered to meddle in Ecclesiastical affairs, this being to put their Sickle too boldly in another man's harvest*: The former refusing to admit *Ferdinand* 2. his Embassadour extraordinary which was Cardinal *Pasman*, *for avoiding* (as the excellent Historian *Bapt. Nani* reports it) *to admit such an Embassadour, he alledged, that a Cardinal honoured with the Purple and a Holy Character could not be employ'd in the service of Secular Princes.*

History of Management of Cardinal *Mazarine. tom.* 1. *part.* 3. *p.* 267.

History of *Venice. lib.* 9. pag. 368.

This is plain dealing however, and so far Princes are obliged; that they will speak their minds sometimes freely. Now I see if Clergymen offend the Laws, Princes are ill-natur'd to punish, because Clergymen owe them obedience to Directive Laws; And if they employ them in a matter unwelcome to his Holiness, the Princes make too bold with them that bear the Impress of a Holy Character; so precarious must the Rule of Princes be over an exempted Clergy. Yet, What Reason may be supposed for this? Certainly so great a Privileg cannot in Reason be pretended by wise and honest men, to be warranted by light and trivial Arguments.

4. General. The Reasons, for exemptions Ecclesiastick.

Two sorts of Arguments I usually meet with urged; First, Drawn *ab Indecoro*, from the unseemliness of subjecting the Clergy to the Government of the Civil Magistrate, and this hath three indecencies in it; of which by and by.

The Second drawn *a Jure*, from their Right to be exempted, and this also is threefold, of which ere long. Mean time return we to the first.

1. Ab indecoro.

It is, say the Papal Orators, a very unseemly thing that the Clergy should be so subjected. For my part if there be an Indecency in it, I could be glad the Indecency were removed, I should think some advantage would thereby accrew to the Reformed Clergy; but without Spectacles of the Papal make, we shall never be able to descry the Indecencies; let us borrow Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s and with them look how unhandsome it is.

That Shepherds be under their Sheep. Answer.

First, *That the Shepherd should be under the Government of the Sheep.* This is a clear Case: But the mischief is, *Similitudes are no Demonstrations*; Nor doth the *Scripture* forbear to *call Kings Shepherds*, and perhaps oftner than the Priest is called so; and *the Argument is retorted Clergy-men are in Seculars* and Civil matters to a Man (except some few crafty Foxes among them) *Sheep, The Prince is their Shepherd, It is undecent that the Sheep should be exempt from the Shepherds Government*: Therefore undecent the Clergy be exempt from the Civil Magistrate, so we dismiss the first.

Secondly,

2. It is an Indecency *that he who to day governeth as the Clergy-man from the Pulpit in confession, or giving ghostly counsel to the Prince, should to morrow be cited before his tribunal, and be judged there.* Very good!

Indecent that he who preacheth this day should to morrow be judged by them he preached to.

2. An *Indecency* I confess there is *that* a *Clergy-man* should by any misdemeanor *deserve it*: But as the Fathers in the Council of *Trent* sometime argued to their advantage: Customs manners and humours alter, and what was handsome of old becomes unhandsome now; and besides, Countrys differ; nothing more graceful than to be mounted on a white Ass among the *Jews*; but the Pope would resent it as an high affront if his Catholick Majesty should by a strange activity (like the Transubstantiating act of the Priest) turn the white *Neapolitan* Courser into an Ass for the Tribute due to his Holiness for the Kingdom of *Naples*, and send it for him to ride on. In a word all we heretical Protestants (and a great many of the good Catholicks of all Countrys) fancy to our selves, That it is very meet to see a Clergy-man preaching to his Prince from the Word of God, whilest he is dutiful and loyal; and to see him imprison'd and executed for his Treasons when he is guilty; if this be an unlucky custom among us, let the Clergy be (as the Protestant will be) loyal, or keep out of places where are practiced such unhandsome customs and laws, as to hang, murthering and fellonious Priests in the common fashion of other Rogues without leave askt of the Pope.

What is truly indecent in the case.

Indecencies as men fancy.

No Protestant can see this Indecency, & many Papists can't see it.

3. A third Indecency is, that the Clergy who are servants of God and sacred persons, should be judg'd by the Vassals of the World, and the impure hands of Laymen. A mighty absurdity if well considered!

Indecent the servants of God be subject to Vassals of the World.

I never knew the full weight of this Argument before I had met with the information that *Stanislaus Orichovius* gave me, *That every common Priest does as much excel a King as a beast does excel a man.* Now by this Rule it were as much pity to see a King judg, condemn, and cause to be hang'd, or headed a Priest, as it would be to see a Horse, or Ass by an usurped power turn upon and execute his Master and driver. In a word when I see the usurping beast so use a man, I will endeavour to prevent the absurdity: But if ever it be my lot to see or hear a Soveraign Prince judg, condemn, and put to death a shaveling, and one of *Romes* Consecrated Priests, (or one of a more reformed profession) under the guilt of capital crimes, I should desire the Father to excuse me untill I saw as clearly as *Stanislaus* did, The Priest was the man, and the King the beast; and ere that will be, my help will stand him in as much stead as a pardon doth after the Criminal is hanged. Lastly I wonder Kings will endure such absurdities when they might prevent it; let *Rome* make their Priest less, and account Kings greater; or if this superlative Greatness be essential to the Priesthood, I humbly submit the resolution, whether it were not fitter such a Priesthood should be abolisht than all Kings be thus made Asses, (and without impair of their Intellectuals, and without the exemplary miracle.

Answer'd.

wrought:

wrought on a proud Heathen, only by the pride and ingratitude of a Papal Clergy, be thus turn'd a-grazing with beasts.

The Reason why the pleas are slighted in the Answer of them.

This is the sum of *Bellarmines* three Arguments, from the Indecency of the thing, and this all the Answer I think them worthy of; since his Eminency hath set up such scar-crows, and would fright us with them, let us have liberty to deride them as men would the bug-bears that Children set up; if better Arguments for the cause could (of this, or any other kind) have been produced, the learned Cardinal would have urged them, and then a better answer might have been given. But a puff will better blow away a feather than a mighty engin, and all the cost and labour would be lost that were bestow'd to bring Cannon, Spade, Mattocks and Engineers to overthrow a poor hutt, or cottage. From these pass we to the second sort of Arguments.

2. Sort of Pleas *a Jure Divino.* Answer.

A *Jure Divino* saith the Canonist, by Divine Right; but *the Canonist* who saith it *hath the wit to let us seek the Text*, for he takes not himself bound in duty to cite it, and we deserve not the kindness that he should do more than he thinks himself obliged unto: Others of the fraternity dissent and think they have reason to pretend the Immunities to be *Jure Humano*; and until they agree how the Clergy among them came by these Immunities we shall not think it breach of charity or good manners to tell them, we wish they came honestly by so rich a Commodity; certainly Christ never gave it them, nor do the more modest pretend his gift, they are content with the collation by Popes Decretals first, or next by favour of General Councils, ever since the Papal Power grew too great for Kings and Emperours; ever since the one durst not contemn, and the other was so hardy as to denounce Excommunications against infringers of the Immunities Ecclesiastical. These two will prove their Right to these Immunities in any place, and at any time where Power and Injustice are too great to be called to account: And as good Right they have to these Immunities as the Pope and Councils could give them, and I hope you will believe the Pope and his Councils would not fail to invest their sworn Vassals with power enough to disturb the Civil power, and lessen it, that the Monarchy of the Papal Church might more speedily and safely be aggrandized; they have these Priviledges indeed from the Ringleaders in the Conspiracy to strengthen it against the just Authority and Soveraignty of Princes. And now you clearly see how honestly they come by it, ask their fellows whether they be thieves?

A Jure Humano answered.

But a third Plea is from the Favour of Princes they enjoy these Immunities. True, the more is their ingratitude and shame, they abuse that favour to the lessening of their Prince; who hath too often had many occasions given him to repent his Grant, to restrain his favour, and to teach the unthankful Clergy more duty, by requiring more. What the Prince giveth they enjoy without our envy, or complaint; let them keep within those bounds, and I will not disturb them. Finally to conclude

clude this point, now the Clergy (in all places of the world where the Prince is Christian) enjoy many considerable Immunities *Jure Humano*, which Immunities they never had Right to claim, till the Prince had Will to give; And which they may not expect to enjoy, when either abuse of them provokes the Prince to revoke them, or emergent inconveniencies perswade him to diminish or null them. What is so granted, is neither Immutable in its Constitution, nor ever intended to the publick prejudice of the Prince and State; nor can it exalt the Clergy into a state of absoluteness and non-subjection to the Prince; or if you would imagin a soft Prince should so inadvertently, and in a transport of zeal to the Clergy and Church, grant them such a Priviledg (as the *Roman* Clergy right or wrong will pretend unto) yet good Statists and best Reason will tell them, that the Grant being made to the prejudice of the Crown, it is neither good nature nor manners, nor justice to require it of their Prince, whose honour and dignity they are bound to conserve; *Errante clave*, the Infallible Decrees are null, say some *Romanists*; *Errante Sceptro*, Civil Grants to Subjects become Nullities. And such are the uncontroulable Immunities of the unsubjected *Roman* Clergy, to whom Princes had been less kind had they foreseen what use would be made of their Royal favours, and to whom they are not less equal and just, though for their Crowns and Honour more resolved and prudent, in recalling the ungovernable Ecclesiasticks to that Subjection, which they ought in equal degrees and readiness with other Subjects give unto their Prince, whether by assistances from their Estates, or by their Persons; both being, as our Thesis averreth, under the Government of the Civil or Secular Prince.

After so prolix Discourse on the positive part of our Position; I come to a briefer handling of the Negative parts of it, which was the fifth and last thing I proposed in the method of our proceeding. And so,

1. Consect. *The highest Power and Authority Ecclesiastical, as such, is lower than the Soveraign and Supream in all Matters Civil and Secular in what man or body of men so ever it be pretendeded* de jure *to be, or* vi & fraude *it be found by Usurpation to be.* This follows from the former suppositions as they have been proved, and is evident enough in it self: If the Clergy as to Bodies and Estates be under the Civil Government, then it follows they are not as Clergy-men Soveraign, for he is no Soveraign in the same respect wherein he is under anothers Authority; these are inconsistent: for Soveraignty and Supremacy set the Person in whom they are, above all within the limits of his Jurisdiction; but Ecclesiastical dignity, or the holy Character, leaves the Person on whom it is impress, under the Subjection he was in before. 5. General.

It is possible (though the case hath seldom happened) that a Soveraign Prince may be a Clergy-man, or he that hath a right to a Soveraignty may succeed in his Right after he hath entred Holy Orders; yet the Powers are distinct, and the Civil usually most esteem'd and retained while the other is laid by; as in *Rome* it sometimes happens among the Princes of the Red Hat, when of a Cardinal they are well pleas'd to become Duke or Prince in Hereditary Principalities, descending on them by the death of the former Heirs. A Soveraignty I know is annexed to some Ecclesiastical Titles and Persons, as in *Germany* to some Bishops, and to the Arch-Bishops, Electors. But they that know their Constitutions can readily tell us, how much they owe to *Jus Humanum* for it, and how little they owe to their Holy Orders, and the Privileg of Clergy stated, *Jure Divino*, or indeed *Jure Ecclesiastico*. And notwithstanding any such intervenient occurrence it still holds a truth, No Clergy-man as such, and in vertue of his Holy Orders is, or can be *Jure*, and of Right a Soveraign and Supream, but is still under the Secular Prince, and his Government in matters Civil.

Girolamo Grimaldi Cardinal, was born with the quality of Soveraign, as Prince of *Monaco*. *Il Cardin. p. 2. l. 2. p.* 151.

Giovanni Casimiro resign'd his Cap, 1648. for the Crown of *Poland*.

Mauritio Son to the D. of *Savoy*, renounc'd for a Lady, *i. e.* Wife.

Cæsar Borgia second Cardinal, murther'd his Brother, turn'd Soldier, was made General of the Church Armies, receiv'd in dowry the Dutchy of *Valenza*; and that by Marriage he might perpetuate the Dukedom in his Family, I guess that this Duke *de Valentinois* quitted his Cardinals Cap in time of *Alexander* the *6th*, who entred the Popedom 1492, and continued to 1502. Such like Metamorphoses you meet with in the Match of the Cardinal *Camillo*, Nephew to *Innocent* the *10th*. An. 1655, or 1654. So Church-dignities were exchanged for Secular advantages with a Wife. Such like occasion inspir'd a Passion into *Pamphilio* towards *Donna Aldobrandina* Princess of *Rossano* and Heiress of the Family, who out-weigh'd all the Cardinals Ecclesiastick concerns, though she married not this her lover: As the Managements of Cardinal *Mazarini*, *Tom.* 1. *part.* 3. *p.* 753 *&c.*

2. Consect. *Were the Pope* (what his flatterers say he is, and his Infallibility confirms) *the Supream Ecclesiastical Person and Head* to that stupendous body of Ecclesiasticks (and were this proved his Right by a better title than ever it was, or ever it will be), *yet still this cannot raise him to the dignity of Soveraign over Secular Princes or Kings.*

For be the Power whatever it is for its eminency, still it is an Ecclesiastical Power, and the Person in whom it is invested derives it to himself not immediately and *virtute Personæ*; but *mediate & virtute officii*; or indeed *Jure Ecclesiæ concesso* by a Right granted to the Church, and by the Church to be convey'd on a fit Person; and so the Person chosen by the Church receives not what Power his boundless ambition can grasp, but what Power the Church can bestow, which hath been proved to be still a Power inferiour to the Secular Power in all Secular affairs. It is a sure Rule in all Cases, *Nihil dat quod in se non habet*. Therefore well did *Sancho* brother of *Alphonsus* the *7th*. proclaims to the world the ridiculous Nothing the Pope gave him, proclaiming him, if he would conquer it, King of *Egypt*; and what his resentments were of such an idle conceit, when in requital of his Holiness bounty he commanded him to be proclaimed Caliph of *Bandas*, on the same condition of conquering

Thus *Adrian 4th* was rebukt for his presumption between 1193 and 1197. *H. Fowlis* Preface to History of Popish Treasons, &c. p. 36.

quering it. In brief, the Pope, pretended Head of the State Eccleſiaſtick *de facto*, is now a free Prince as he is Pope, and hath a Secular Power annexed to his Eccleſiaſtical Office. But if *Conſtantine*'s Grant, and ſome other Princes bounty be a forgery, it is eaſie to ſay how their Holineſſes came by, and how honeſtly they continue the poſſeſſion of ſuch Power: And if preſcription of time and poſſeſſion will not bar a Soveraign Prince his claim, there may ariſe ſome brisk Prince in the Empire who may ſtart a better title to thoſe Dominions, and reduce the Pope to the Primitive *decorum* of Biſhop of the firſt See; requiring him to be content with what Immunities the Imperial Council ſhall judg fit to allow him, ſince in all likelihood they will be more than were ever given by Chriſt to St. *Peter*, and his real or pretended Succeſſors. Let him whileſt he can, retain his Temporal Soveraignty, and within his own Dominions be above all Perſons in all Cauſes; yet this doth not flow out of his Eccleſiaſtick Office immediately, directly, and *per ſe*, as he is Biſhop, which is an order wholly of different nature to Secular Power and Matters. And therefore were he Univerſal Biſhop, yet his power would be but the power of a Biſhop, that is in Spirituals; and the engin of their own making cannot draw in Temporals *in ordine ad Spiritualia*. That was, as the Huntſmans dog in his younger days, nimble and hold-faſt, but the Cur is now old, and his teeth worn out, and every free Prince now will ſhake him off. They are weary of the cheat, and I hope will not let an Uſurper *indirecte & conſequenter*, take out of their hands that which God, Nature, Grace and Reaſon, have *directe & neceſſario* entruſted in their hands.

3. *Conſect.* The Clergy being proved in Body and Eſtate as to Civil affairs under the Government of the Secular Prince; *No Clergy-man of what degree ſoever he be, nor any body of Clergy-men combined together, can abſolve the Subjects of any Prince or free State from their Oaths of Allegiance. And if it be pretended, he or they may do ſo, the pretence is wicked; and if the pretended Power be executed, the Subject notwithſtanding is as much bound as ever, nay ſomewhat more bound on this occaſion, becauſe the Prince is in an apparent danger*; out of which to reſcue him, every good Subject ought to contribute his aſſiſtance for his Princes ſafety. The Excommunication, or the menace of an approaching Excommunication from ſuch a proud pretender, may be juſt reaſon why Princes ſhould require renew'd aſſurance of their Subjects Allegiance, and why Subjects ſhould give new inſtances of their conſtant duty; but it can be no reaſon why Subjects ſhould think themſelves free from their Obedience and Oaths. The condition of Princes through the multitude and weight of their affairs is of all mens the moſt uneaſie, when it is (the moſt it can be) eaſed by a ready and univerſal Obedience in the Subject; but how miſerable would it be on ſuppoſition that their Kingdoms were at the

diſpoſal of a forreigner! How unfaithful are our Hiſtorians, or how ſhameleſs hath the encroaching pride of the Pope and the Papal Clergy been! either they who write the ſtories of Ages paſt have moſt injuriouſly dealt with their own and other ſucceeding Ages, or the Papal power hath with might and main ſet it ſelf to ruin the Regal and Imperial Power. Now what will become of the Maxim which pleaded ſtifly for the Eccleſiaſtical power? 'Tis retorted thus: All Authority appointed of God, is by him entruſted with Power and Authority ſufficient to conſerve it ſelf, and effect its proper ends: But if a Biſhop, who is a Subject, may depoſe the Prince, and releaſe the ſworn Allegiance, the Power of the Prince is not ſufficient to preſerve it ſelf among Subjects; If the Biſhop be a forreigner, as the Pope is to all Princes, who doth excommunicate, and depoſe, and releaſe Subjects, then the Princes Power is not ſufficiently qualified to preſerve it ſelf againſt ſtrangers and uſurping enemies.

In brief; Thoſe that are Papal Biſhops, and were born Subjects, are equally with other Subjects, natural Leige-men to their Prince; for we have proved that the dignity of Biſhops doth not exalt them above the condition of Subjects: Now it is certain Subjects cannot abſolve their fellow Subjects; none can looſe the bond which doth as much tye himſelf as another; nor can Rebellion acquit Rebellion in a Subject. Thoſe Biſhops who being forreigners to a Prince, are always to be watcht as ſuſpicious, and moſtly to be oppos'd as enemies, though Biſhops (as Popes are accounted) can never be thought perſons to be intruſted with a Power over Kings and Princes, whom they treat with no other kindneſs than a man doth one whom he reſolveth to overthrow or humble with the firſt opportunity: So that as it is not in the Dignity and Office it ſelf, to convey an uncontroulable Power to a native Subject in any caſe over his Soveraign, ſo neither is it in the Office to convey ſuch a power to a forreigner; and both are a weakening of the Civil power to a degree of impotence that cannot defend its Subjects, or preſerve it ſelf, or attain the neceſſary ends of Government.

4. *Conſect.* If the Dignity of the Clergy be not ſufficient to advance the Clergy-man high enough above the Civil Magiſtrate (as hath been proved) in Civil Matters; *Then were the Pope Univerſal Biſhop, and had he rightful Power to Excommunicate* (which yet is not proved by any of his paraſites, nor yielded by any Proteſtant); *yet could he not deprive the Prince or King ſo excommunicated of his Dominions in part or whole.*

For in this caſe the Pope muſt act as a Biſhop, and this Office, as it is a Spiritual Office, and the Rules of it are Spiritual, ſo the effects and ends of it are alſo Spiritual, and ought to keep within theſe limits and bounds; but now, when (after admonition and intreaties prove vain) the Univerſal Biſhop ſhould Excommunicate, he hath gone to the utmoſt

that

that his Rule directs, or his Authority can enable him to; the Deposing of a King, the giving his Kingdom to any that have the hardiness to attempt, and the success to gain it; as it is wholly of a Secular nature, so it is wholly forreign to the Office of any Bishop. And it hath brought the greatest confusion, wars, bloodshed, and desolation into the Christian World; that by this we might guess from whom this usurped Power comes, since we know there have been such direful effects of it, and these effects the natural and proper effects of such unjust pretences. The Censure of the Church is an execution of a Spiritual Power, and was never appointed to leap so prodigiously high as with its foot to kick down the Crowns of Kings and free Princes; this (*transitus de genere ad genus*) skipping from a just execution of Ecclesiastical Power, into the Usurpation of a boundless Power in Affairs Secular over Princes and Kings, is the most insolent and intolerable presumption; and which gives Gods Vicegerents in Civils, a justifiable plea to hate and oppose the pride and designs of the Papal Clergy, who by this means have with a kind hand given their inferiour Clergy so happy a lift, that the meanest person in Holy Orders among them, is *Jure & virtute Officii*, a better man than his Prince, whom he exceeds as much as a man exceeds a beast, or God exceeds the Priest, if you'l believe their flatterers. Amongst whom the Learned Cardinal *Bellarmine* (misimployed in the Office of Master of the Ceremonies) does set Kings below Bishops, Priests, and Deacons too: so glorious is this *Roman* Church, that Kings like our drossie bodies, sons of the earth, fall short of the Church-men as much as the body falls short of the Soul. Bravely spoken! what pity is it that every Ecclesiastical Sacred Head hath not an estate and revenues to maintain his Grandeur as much in Magnificence above Kings as their Office hath set them: if such transcendent Honour be the effect of Papal Ordination, our King and Parliament have reason to continue the Prohibition against the Subjects of this Kingdom going beyond the Seas to take Orders. It is not safe to have Subjects so advanced, and I do not wonder that Rebellion in a Clergy-man of the *Roman* Mint is become so small a *Peccadillo*, or rather thin'd into an invisible mist, and though the Priest be visible in the Rebellion and Treason, neither the Traytor, nor Rebel can be seen or found: alas good men and precious! the world unkindly owneth not their Excellency, and they by natural propensities (flowing from their constitutive principles) do innocently aspire to a state equal to their Orders, which blind Hereticks nick-name Rebellion, and jealous Princes brand as Treason; and so the innocent Clergy (when they have the luck to be taken in it) are condemned and executed for Traytors. But the comfort is the enlightned Consistory at *Rome* can see and distinguish the Clergy-man *quoad substantiam*, innocent, nay meritorious; it is the Prince or State which mistook him, and under the separate accidents and form of a Traytor bloodily,

Stapleton. Antidot. Victorian.

De Pontifice lib. 1. cap. 7.

Bellarm. de laic. cap. 8.

bloodily cut off the mans head. Dull Souls that will not be informed in the myſtery of Tranſubſtantiating Rebels as well as bread. Well, howe're it is that their Clergy muſt being judged by a ſevere Secular Judg die *(ſub forma perduellium)* in the unhandſome dreſs of Traytors, yet by the moſt indulgent hands of his *Roman* Holineſs, the World ſhall be informed of the error, and in compenſation for the hard uſage they met with be made as ſubſtantial and real Saints as ever the Pope made any: ſo may *Garnet* be executed at *Tyburn*, but be St. *Henry* at *Rome*; and thoſe that were *Beautifou's* and ſet the World on fire, and threatned more prodigious Calamities to the World, are made Stars of great light and glory in the *Roman* heaven. Such unintelligible Doctrines, and ſuch intolerable practices have attended the licentious friſk of the Biſhop of *Rome* when τῶν ἐθνῶν, he excommunicates and makes Kings and Princes his prey, and ἁρπάσῃ λέων, ſeizeth and devoureth the prey; and is thus become μικτὸν χιμαῖρα, *Chimera* real: Which may not be too ſeverely imputed to levity in me, ſince really I could not tell what to make of him; for in his Fore-parts I find the mouth of a Man, and hear the words of a Father in admonitions, but when I have looked down to the feet I ſee the Paws of a Lion, and his Talons always bloody with the prey under his feet torn to pieces, or deeply wounded; So I clearly ſee him in the Proſpect hiſtory gives of him, their own Gloſſary repreſents him not much more to his advantage:

Many have compar'd it (*Rome*) to the Monky that hugs its young ones to death, for juſt ſo do the Church-men who embrace every one with a Paternal affection, but in thoſe embraces they that receive them find their ruin. *Il Nipotismo, part.* 1. *l.* 1. *§* 2.

Clement. Proem. Gloſſ. v. Papa.

Papa ſtupor Mundi ——
Nec Deus es, nec homo, quaſi neuter es inter utrumque.

So of a well-conſtituted Officer as Chriſt and *Peter* left him (if you'l believe them) he is made a miſhapen Monſter, and the wonder of the World; and now in the unjuſt claim of the Father of Lies draws deceived proſelytes to worſhip him, ſhewing them the Kingdoms of the World, and the Glory of them, with promiſe that as they merit by their good ſervice to the Apoſtolick-Chair, he will give them a right, and when they can they may take poſſeſſion of his gift, for unto him pertain all theſe things, and to whomſoever he will he giveth them; and I aſſure you it is neither *Jure Divino*, nor *Jure Humano*, but *quaſi Neutro*, i.e. *Jure Inferno*.

5. *Conſect.* Hence it follows, *That Emperours, Kings, Princes and free States, are not Rightful Subjects to the Pope, or to any other ſingle Eccleſiaſtical Perſon, nor to any body of the Clergy-men, neither in Synods with Presbyterians, or in Convocations with Epiſcopal, nor in pretended General Councils with Papiſts, nor in the Conſiſtory or Conclave with the Cardinals and Pope collected together.* He that deſigned the Office in his Church

Church hath left these Officers under the Obedience of the Civil Magistrate in all Civil Matters which concern the Government of their Estates and Persons. In which cause so many have appeared, and so clearly vindicated the Royal Prerogatives and Soveraign Authority of Kings; not only Protestant Writers, but among the Papists themselves many very learned Pens have asserted the Supream and Soveraign Power of free States, that it is become in most Countrys a ridiculous Claim the Pope maketh, or any of his Vassals flatter him with, That their Prince is a Vassal and Subject to his Holiness; and that is now become as long since it should have been, a Trayterous Tenet and worthy of death, which was in the heighth of Popish Tyranny a necessary principle of the Papal Religion. How ill-natur'd soever the Children of that Church have proved, abridging their Father of his Power; I will not now enquire; but might a stranger to the Father and his Children speak a few words indifferently to both, I would adventure to say, it had been justice and honesty in the Ghostly Father to have left his Children the Power and Authority which he gave them, who said the Magistrates were gods, and then the Primitive kindness of Kings like *Constantine* the Great would have ensured the favours and observances of Princes to the Clergy: But since the Papal Infallibility hath almost reduced this affair to this hard choice, Either that we must have no Pope and Exempt Clergy, or no free and Soveraign Monarchs, I am easily inclined to believe, the Secular Princes will rather chuse that the Ecclesiasticks should part with their Immunities than that Princes should part with their Soveraignty; and how great a part of the Christian World would joyn with them is not hard to guess. The Soveraignty of the Pope is an Article of the Popes political Faith, but I verily think he hath more wit and care of his Soul than to make it an article of his Christian Faith: And if he will venture his soul, and the souls of his sheep on gage that he may keep his present Grandeur, I am well satisfied that he is not my shepherd, and I am not a little glad that there are so many Papists that do not make this an Article of their Faith. Free States and Kingdoms do know that Supream Soveraignty is not essential to Christs Vicar, *Peters* Successor, or Universal Bishop, that Exemptions of the Clergy are favours of the Prince and not natural and necessary properties of the Office; and which is ill news for *Rome*, have well considered the distinction between being of Communion with the Church Catholick, and with the Pope as first Bishop, and being in subjection to the Pope as to a Soveraign. They now are skilled in the Method of observing the Church, and opposing the Court of *Rome*. And though I know not what may *(per Possibile)* come to pass among men, and what King may make himself against all Right a Subject to the Pope, yet I am sure no King or Emperour can ever be rightfully the subject of the Pope who at most is but Bishop of the first See.

SER MON

SERMON IV.

The POPE of ROME is ANTICHRIST.

2 Thes. 2. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. *Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.*

4. *Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.*

5. *Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things.*

6. *And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time.*

7. *For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way.*

8. *And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:*

9. *Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs and lying wonders,*

10. *And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish: because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.*

WE will first give you an Account of the Apostles writing here so fully concerning Antichrist, and so proceed to handling the Words. The reason of his falling on this subject here, was upon the preaching of some among them, who told them, that the coming of the Lord to judgment would be very sud-

denly

denly, in that age and time in which they lived, upon which report they were in a very great fear and dread. *v.* 2. They were shaken in mind, and this terrour and consternation of Spirit there is expressed under a double Metaphor. 1. From a Sea-storm that tears the Vessel from the Anchor and Harbour; so much the word σαλευθῆναι here used doth import, which comes from σάλος which signifies a Tempest at Sea. 2. By θροεῖσθαι taken from Souldiers, who by a panick fear arising among them, puts them into a disorder and confusion, so that they have neither head, nor heart, nor hand to act in a due manner: So it was with the *Thessalonians*, by reason of false Teachers, who by their blasts and storms of false Doctrines, *Eph.* 4. 14. shake men from their stedfastness: they were at present under great distraction and fear, from the false Teachers who did delude them; 1. By a pretence to an extraordinary Spirit, or Visions, and Revelations. 2. By Word and Preaching. 3. By Letter as from *Paul*, by which works they did exceedingly deceive them; and perswaded them to believe that the end of the World was at hand.

Whence we observe, 1. *That false Teachers do use all possible means and diligence, to prevail with persons to believe their false Doctrines.*

2. *False Teachers do so far prevail with many, that they rent and tear them as with a tempestuous wind, and put them into a consternation of Spirit as by a panick fear so as that they can neither keep to the Truth, nor act according to it.*

In the Words you have, 1. The Revelation of the greatest Enemy that ever was against Christ and his Church, in the third *vers.* and the eighth. 2. You have a full and large Description of that Enemy, by several circumstances of time, place, *&c.* As also by several Characters and Names, by which this Enemy may be known from all other Enemies of Christ that ever were, or should be in the World. I shall wholly wave their opinion, who contrary to the whole stream of Interpreters, do take the meaning of this place to be concerning Christs Coming to destroy *Jerusalem*, and them that crucified Christ; and the Apostacy to be the Christians breaking off compliance with the impenitent *Jews*, and departing from them to the *Gentiles*: and the Man of Sin here described they take to be *Simon Magus*, together with the *Gnosticks*. But that this cannot be so meant, is plain, from the Season of entring of the Man of Sin, *&c.* who was to be revealed, and upon his Revelation, there would follow an Apostacy from the Faith before Christs Coming to judgment. That which did so terrifie the *Thessalonians* was this, that Christ's second Coming was at hand; then the Apostle tells them, that there was to be a great Apostacy upon the Revelation of the Man of Sin, which was to be many years, some Hundreds of years after this. As for *Simon Magus* and the *Gnosticks*, they were revealed before the writing of this Epistle; *Hugo Grot.* Dr. *Hammond*, &c. This Enemy is set forth as if he were a single person, but it is not so to be taken

in this place; for it is frequent in Scripture to ſet forth a Body Politick, or a Kingdom, or State, by a particular Perſon or *Individuum*. In *Dan.* 7. 1, 2, 3, *&c.* there be four Kingdoms, or Monarchies, which were in a Succeſſion one after another in the World, deciphered by four great Beaſts, which are interpreted to be four Kingdoms, *verſ.* 17. or four Kings; and the fourth Beaſt is called the fourth Kingdom, *ver.* 23. And the vulgar Tranſlation renders *verſ.* 17. four Kingdoms: So that each Beaſt ſignifieth a multitude of men in a Succeſſion, under one Government for ſeveral Ages; and ſo conſequently the Head and Horns ſignifie the Power, and Sovereignty, of ſuch a Kingdom for a long time in a Succeſſion.

So we find, *Rev.* 12. 1, the ſtate of the Primitive Apoſtolical Church ſet forth by a Woman in travel; and *verſ.* 6. 14, by a Woman in the Wilderneſs. So *Rev.* 13. 11. the two-horned Beaſt, which is the ſame with the falſe Prophet, *Rev.* 10. 13, and 19, 20, and 20. 10, doth not ſignifie a ſingle Perſon, or a ſucceſſion of ſingle Perſons (ſuppoſe the Popes) but a Body of Deceivers under one Head or Government. It is generally agreed on by Proteſtant Writers, That the Pope as Head of that Antichriſtian ſtate which is here deſcribed, is pointed at in this place; or that the Papacy, Head and Members, in a Succeſſion making up one Body Politick, is that Monſter which they call Antichriſt. It is on all hands agreed on, That where-ever we find all theſe Characters, together with the Circumſtances ſet down in the Text, to concenter, that muſt be The Antichriſt, who was to be brought forth into the World before the ſecond coming of Chriſt. He tells us of One to come, a ſtrange One, a monſtrous One, ſuch a One as never was before; and that you may not be miſtaken in this Prodigious One, he gives us the lively portraicture of him.

The firſt Character by which Antichriſt is ſet forth, is the grand Apoſtacy which ſhould attend his riſe and reign.

Let us now deſcend to the particulars as they lye in the Text. 1. Antichriſt is deſcribed by the Apoſtacy which ſhould ariſe in the Church upon the coming of this Monſter: He is an Apoſtate, and the cauſe of an Apoſtacy: there was to be ἡ Ἀποστασία, a very great Apoſtacy before his full Revelation, *verſ.* 3. Apoſtacy is taken 1. Politically, ſo ſome take it for a falling from the *Roman* Empire. 2. Eccleſiaſtically, to fall from the Church or True Religion. 3. Figuratively, the Subject for the Adjunct, meaning the chief in Place and Power, that cauſeth others to fall away; as 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. There ſhall be an Apoſtacy, there ſhall be ſuch as ſhall fall away, and cauſe others ſo to do.

In the two latter ſenſes it is taken here; for the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, ſet out by the Lamb with two Horns, *Rev.* 13. 11. is the grand Apoſtate and a cauſe of the great Apoſtacy of many, by cauſing by force and fraud to worſhip the Beaſt and his Image, *verſ.* 12, 13, *&c.* The time of this Apoſtacy is a ſpecial mark of Antichriſt's riſing, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. This Apoſtacy was to be in the latter times of the fourth

fourth Monarchy, ſet out by Fourty two Months, and One thouſand two hundred and Sixty days, *Rev.* 11. 2, 3. and chap. 13. 5. The Apoſtacy of the Church from the Rule of Faith and Worſhip, by ſpiritual Fornication is a ſignal note of Antichriſt, or the Antichriſtian State, of which the Pope is the Head; and his proper See is *Babylon* the *Metropolis*: And the Body which was to be ordered by this falſe Prophet as its ſupreme Head, was, and is, the Beaſt of *Rome*, with Seven Heads and Ten Horns, and Ten Crowns on his Horns. *Rev.* 13. 1. This Apoſtacy as to the time, is upon the riſing of the Antichriſtian Papal State, when thoſe Doctrines of Demons, and forbidding Marriage and Meats, which are peculiar to the Church of *Rome*, came into the Church; the old Pagan *Roman* Empire was broken to pieces, and had its deadly wound, which afterwards was healed by the two-Horned Beaſt, *Rev.* 13. 12. Framed into a likely Image of the former Pagan Beaſt, by reaſon of which, the viſible Worſhip of Chriſt in the Church gradually was caſt out, and the ſpiritual Fornication of Saints and Angels, Relicks, Images, and ſuch like, which is renewed Gentiliſm and refined Paganiſm, came up gradually into the Church of *Rome*.

The Revelation of the Man of Sin doth appear by his riſing gradually, and the time of his riſing will appear by the Apoſtacy from the Rule of Faith, Worſhip, and Manners; ſo that if we can find the Defection of the Church, we know one chief Character of Antichriſt. Some begin the Apoſtacy from the Primitive purity about 396. Many Popiſh errours come into the Church: *Wolph.* in *Centenar.* *Jerom.* 390. complains of the Avarice and Corruption of the Clergy, and of the prohibition of Marriage and Meats. And *Auguſtin* 399. complains how the Church was fallen from her Purity. *Wolphius* in his Epiſtle, and in his Book, *An.* 390. and 400. brings in a large Catalogue of errours crept into the Church, by which the times of the grand Apoſtacy may be known: And it pleaſed God to ſpeak in a wonderful way from Heaven in thoſe times, by prodigious Comets, *An.* 383, and 389. *Alſted. Chron. Comet.* Thus was the Man of Sin gradually revealed, and the Apoſtacy did gradually proceed. Indeed the Pope could not yet ſhew himſelf in the full exerciſe of his Power in the *Roman* Empire, for the Civil Power of the *Roman* Empire would not bear ſuch a competition as the Hierarchy of *Rome*; and therefore the *Roman* Empire which is a Civil State, was to be taken out of the way, *verſ.* 6, 7, 8. It was to be removed from the Seventh Head, the Old *Roman* Beaſt, as it was a Civil Government, and placed ſomewhere elſe, *i. e.* on the Pope or Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, which uſurps the Power of both Swords. This could not be done before the deadly wound was given to the *Cæſarian* family, which the idolatrous blaſphemous Beaſt was to ſucceed: This is the Beaſt which carrieth the Whore, *Rev.* 17: 3. which could not be done till the Imperial Sovereign Power of *Rome* was broken, and tranſlated to the Pope; then the Man of Sin was more fully reveal-

ed. Upon this ground, *Jerom* when he heard of the taking of *Rome* by *Alericus* King of the *Goths*, expected the coming of Antichrist, *Epist. ad Agerachiam, Qui tenebat* (saith he) *de medio fit & non intelligemus Antichristum appropinquare?* He that letteth is removed, and shall we not know that Antichrist is nigh? So in *præfat. l.* 8. in *Ezech. pascitur anima & ebliviscitur, &c.*

Some state the beginning of the Apostacy, and the Revelation of the Man of Sin higher, some lower, but they agree in the main, That this Apostacy was by the Pope, and upon the fall of the *Roman* Empire: Some will have his Revelation to be about the time of King *Pepin*, and *Charlemain*. It is true the Papacy then came to a great height, but the Church was very corrupt in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Manners, and polluted with spiritual Fornication after Saints, and Angels, and Images, &c. long before that time. So that we may infer, that if the Apostacy came in with the Pope or Papacy, as this did rise to a height, so did the Apostacy from the Truth, then this Character doth agree to the Pope, by which he may be known to be The Antichrist.

2. The second character is the special and most significant expressions applied to Antichrist.

2. The Second Character, by which the Pope is set forth, so as to be known to be Antichrist; 1. He is, ὁ ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας; ὁ υἱος τῆς ἀπωλείας, v. 3. ὁ ἀντικείμενος, v. 4. ὁ ἄνομος, v. 8. The Man of Sin, the Son of perdition: By an Hebrew phrase expressing one that is a Superlative supereminent sinner, *impietatis coryphæus*, as *Pet. Molin.* phraseth him; As we say a Man of Blood, for a Man thirsting after Blood, or a cruel bloody Man. The Son of Perdition, *perditissimus*, One (by an Hebraism) set upon destruction of others, the most flagitious profligate Sinner, the most inhuman cruel Destroyer, to whom the titles of *Apollyon*, and *Abaddon* do most properly belong; He is actively and passively the Son of Perdition, *Rev.* 17. 8. and 19. 20. He is the great destroyer of Souls, *vers.* 12. He is the ὁ ἀντικείμενος, the great Enemy of all Enemies of Christ, though he is not called by the name of The Antichrist; yet here is a word with the Article prefixed to it, which carrieth the like importance with it. He is the worst and greatest Enemy of Christ, who under a pretence of friendship and love to Christ, doth usurp and undermine his Offices; He appears like a Lamb in his deportment, and speaks like a Dragon, *Rev.* 13. 11. 2. The Papacy is of all other Bodies Politick the worst, being set out with such expressions as have the greatest *Emphasis* in them; It would be too great a business for a Sermon to give you an account of their Tyranny, Cruelty, Luxury, Rapaciousness, Avarice, Blasphemy, Whoredom, Spiritual and Corporal; all the Abominations of the Three former Monarchies do meet in this Fourth, of which the Papacy is the last edition, *Rev.* 13. 2. That Beast set out there is the *Roman* Empire, as Papal not Pagan, as appears by the Crowns on the Horns: But the Pagan Empire had the Crowns on the Heads, *Rev.* 12. 3. Now that wickedness

in

in which those former Empires did excel did meet in the Papal, *Rev.* 13. 2. and therefore it is set out by the Lions mouth, the feet of the Bear, and the Leopard. He is set out in his Type, *Dan.* 11. 28, 30, 31, 32. Or, he himself is set forth (as some think) wholly against the Covenant, expressing an indignation against it with all his might, setting himself against the Sanctuary and daily Sacrifice. *Gruterus* and others understand it of Antichrist, and not of *Antiochus*. The Scripture when it expresseth a person or thing in a signal way, doth it by an affixed article as here, or by an abstract: Here the article sheweth an eminence of wickedness; so the abstract, *Cant.* 1. 4. Heb. *uprightnesses*, by which righteous persons are set forth; so a proud person is set out by pride, *Jer.* 50. 3. we render it, *O you most proud!* So *sin* for a *great sinner*, Prov. 13. 6. So the Man of Sin signifies the most Sinful Man.

He is called the ὁ ἄνομος, v. 8. *That wicked one*, the most lawless one, breaking all bounds and bands, and casting away the cords of Christ, as they, *Psal.* 2. 3. that will not come under the yoke of Christ, nor stoop to his Scepter, that will not that Christ should reign, as *Luke* 19. 14. This boundless lawless one is therefore set out by a most unruly Beast, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2, &c. and by the Whore of *Babylon*, *Rev.* 17. 1, 2, 3, &c. riding the Beast and making the Kings to commit Fornication with her, and making the Inhabitants of the Earth drunk with the Wine of her Fornication; This is the Mother of Harlots and abominations, drunk with the blood of the Saints and Martyrs, *v.* 5, 6. This the lawless one is the Antichristian state, the Man of Sin under another notion. Lawless, ὁ ἄνομος, as to Scripture, so in point of Doctrine, Worship, Government, and Manners; as to Humane Laws and Powers, being above them all; as to Oaths of Allegiance, &c. as to Exemption of his Clergy, and such like.

If these Epithetes which the Holy Ghost gives to Antichrist, do all belong to the Pope or Papacy, then he may be justly thought to be described in this place.

3. The third particular by which Antichrist is set out is the *place*, *v.* 4. he sitteth in the Temple of God; there he exerciseth his Jurisdiction and Tyranny, and shews himself God, *i.e.* in the Church, the place of the visible external Worship of God, which is called the *outward Court*, *Rev.* 11. 2. which is trod under foot by the Draconizing-beast, or Papacy, profaning the whole Worship of God, and a new Gentilism; therefore the outward Court is cast out, and forbid to be measured in regard that lawless Monster hath brake all bands, and will not come under any Laws and Rules of Christ, therefore they and their Worship are cast out. The place where he sits is called, ναὸς, the Tem-

3. Is the place where he sitteth and resideth. *Philip. Nicolai de Antichristo*, proves the Pope to be Antichrist from this character. See Dr. *Whitaker*, *Danæus*, *Chamier*, *Pet. Molin.* *Junius*, &c. that write of Antichrist, and prove the Pope to be the Antichrist from this place.

ple,

ple or Houſe of Gods Worſhip. So it is ſaid of the King of *Babylon*, *That he will ſit on the Mount of the Congregation*, Iſa. 14. 13. *i.e.* Mount *Sion*, the place of Gods Reſidence and Worſhip: So here the K. of *Babylon* he takes upon him to ſit in the Temple, or Church of God, which is called, ναὸς, *Epheſ.* 2. 21. 1 *Cor.* 3. 16. 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. Some will have it for the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, that muſt be the Seat of Antichriſt, which is in the power of the *Turk*; but this cannot be, In regard the other Characters will not ſuit with the *Turks*, but do fall in ſuitably with the Pope. And ſo *Jerom* takes the notion of ναὸς in *Queſt. ad Algeſiam*, and *Auguſt. de Civit. Dei*, c. 19. he ſaith, *Rectius dici ſeſſurum in Templum Dei*, εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ſo the Greek; *Tanquam ipſe ſit Templum Dei quod eſt Eccleſia*: As we ſay *in amicum*, i.e. *velut amicus*. This may very well agree with the Papacy, who pretend to be the Holy Catholick and the only True Church. So then the Pope ſits in the midſt of his Holy Catholick Church of *Rome*, exerciſing his Tyrannical Power over the people of God; ſo that *Mahometans* cannot be the Church, they wholly renounce the name of the Church of Chriſt.

But how can the Antichriſtian Synagogue where Satans throne is, be called the Temple of God?

Reſp. The Scripture ſpeaketh of things as they once were, though they do not continue ſo to be; and ſpeaks it of perſons as they are in pretence and outward profeſſion, though they be not ſuch as they pretend to be. *Abigail* is called the Wife of *Nabal* when he was dead, 1 *Sam.* 30. 5. And *Simon* the Leper though he were healed, *Mat.* 26. 6. ſo the City that was a Harlot is called the *faithful City*, Iſa. 1. 21. It was called the *holy City*, *Joh.* 4. 21. where they worſhipped. It was called the *holy place*, *Mat.* 24. 15. till the Deſolation by *Veſpaſian*; and *Mat.* 27. 53. the *holy City*, though they had turned the Houſe of God into a den of thieves, *Mat.* 21. 15. and the City was a bloody City that *killed the Prophets*, Mat. 23. 37. Beſides ſometime the Scripture ſpeaks of it *quoad opinionem hominum*, as they are reputed by men, 2 *Chron.* 28. 23. *They ſacrificed to the gods of* Damaſcus *that they would help them*; they are called gods on that account; ſo *Judg.* 10. 13, 14. This Character doth very well agree to the Pope, or Papacy, to prove it to be the Antichriſtian ſtate here ſet forth.

The Fourth Character is his Self-exaltation.

4. He is ſet forth by Self-exaltation: ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν; and not only above all that have the title of gods as the Civil Magiſtrates, *Pſal.* 82. 1, 6. Which have the title of gods by virtue of the Authority that God hath inveſted them withal, *Joh.* 10. 34, 35. But alſo above the true God, by taking on him to do more than God himſelf, ἢ σέβασμα, *quicquid eſt Auguſtum*, whatſoever is held worthy the higheſt degree of Civil Reverence as is the Majeſty of Kings. *He as God*, he takes on him the Honour due to God himſelf, and will be adored by the higheſt Power upon Earth. He that does all this muſt needs

needs be the Antichrist, but such things doth the Pope; let him look to the conclusion.

Molin. in Vale. c.6. shews how the Pope is called God, how they plead that he ought so to be, whereof several of their own Writers, especially out of the *Glossa Extravagant. cum Inter.* Which hath these words, *Credere dominum Deum nostrum Papam, conditorem dictæ Decretalis, & ipsius, sic non potuisse statuere ut statuit, hæreticum censeretur.* It is Heretical to believe our Lord God the Pope the maker of the said Decretal not to have power to Decree as he hath decreed. And *Bellarm. l.1. de Pontif.* saith, (speaking of the Popes Supremacy) *Ecclesia secluso etiam Christo unum caput habere debet*, The Church (secluding Christ) ought to have one Head; this is the Pope which is Oecumenical Bishop. So they attribute the Offices and Excellencies of Christ to the Pope. They say, He is the Father of all Christians, which belongs to Christ, *Isa. 9. 7.* That he is the Teacher of the Church, and the Spouse of the Church, the Foundation of Faith, the Lord of Lords, the chief Corner-stone, universal Judg and Infallible, who is to judg all others, but to be judged of none. These all belong to Christ alone, and he that thus exalts himself, and arrogates these things to himself must needs be Antichrist. *Philip de Nicolai de Antichristo*, shews how the Pope taking all these Titles to himself, proveth that he is Antichrist. As also the Protestant Divines generally prove him to be Antichrist by this Character.

Some go further in this Argument, and shew how the Pope takes on him to do more than God. It is frequent among their Divines and Canonists to say, *Papam posse dispensare contra Apostolum & contra vetus Testamentum.* That the Pope can dispense against the Apostles, and against the Old Testament. That the Pope can make new Simbols. That he can dispense with things forbidden of God. *Bel. l.4. de Pœnitent. c.13.* saith, *Indulgentiæ faciunt, ut pro iis pœnis quæ nobis per indulgentias condonantur, non teneamur præcepto illo, de faciendis dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus*; That as to those penalties from which we are freed by Indulgences, we are not bound to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance. Nay he goes further, *Lib.4. de summo Pont. c.5. Si Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, & virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare*; If the Pope should err so as to command vices, and forbid virtues, the Church would be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues to be evil, unless she will sin against Conscience.

Thus blasphemously do they speak of the Supereminence of the Pope above God himself; and as for all Civil Powers he is absolutely free from them, and much above them all, *Vid. text. Decret. dist. 96. c.7. Satis evidenter ostenditur a seculari potestate non solvi prorsus nec ligari Pontificem posse, quem constat a Constantino Deum appellatum, cum nec Deum ab hominibus judicari manifestum sit*; Since the Pope is god, therefore he cannot either be bound, or loosed by men. Their words are in the body of the Canon-Law set forth by the command of *Gregory* 13.

Anv.

An. 1591. "From this it appears that the Pope is above Scripture, Coun-"cils, Princes, and all Powers upon Earth, upon the account of his Di-"vinity It is common amongſt them at leaſt to equalize the Popes De-crees to the Holy Scripture; and that the Popes Decretals are to be ac-counted Canonical; and that the Popes Determinations are to be pre-ferred above the Scripture; with many ſuch like blaſphemies. See *Decret. cum gloſſa ed. Tug.* Ann. 1510. *Diſt.* 19. & *c.* 6. *Diſt.* 40. And which is worſt of all, they aſſert the Scriptures are inferiour to the Popes Decrees. *Ut fidem non faceret, neq; neceſſitatem credendi inducere queant, niſi Papa per canonizationem quam vocant, iis authoritatem prius impertiat*, Decret. *l.* 2. *tit.* 23. *de preſumptionibus, chapt.* That the Scriptures have no Authority ſo as to procure belief of them, unleſs they can be firſt canonized by the Pope. It is no wonder though the Pope utter-eth ſuch Blaſphemies, ſince he is the Head of that Idolatrous Beaſt full of Blaſphemies, *Rev*, 13. 5, 6.

Since they will have the Pope to be ſuch a Supream Head to the Church militant, as Chriſt *Quoad influxum interiorem*, ſo he *quoad influxum exteriorem Doctrinæ & fidei*, Bel. *l.* 2. *de Concil. authoritate, c.* 15. Since they will have him not only to be equal with Chriſt, but above him; he being able to redeem Souls out of Purgatory, which Chriſt never did, and is affirmed by them: *Joh. Turrecremata* and others that licenſed the Revelations of *Bridget*, they let go that paſſage in that Book, *Bonus Gregorius oratione ſua, etiam infidelem Cæſarem elevavit ad altiorem gradum.* By which it appears that the Pope hath done that which Chriſt never did; and that the Popes Charity is larger than Chriſts, who prayed not for the World, *Joh.* 17. 6. but the Pope prays for the Damned. Since I ſay, they will have their Pope with all theſe prodigious Blaſphemies, ſince they will have their Lord God the Pope thus lifting up his Head above Luciſer, let them have him, and believe his Lies and Impoſtures; ſince they reject the Truth whereby *they might be ſaved, let them believe his Lies that they may be damned*, v. 10, 11. *Qui Satanam non odit amet tua dogmata Papa.*

The Fifth Character by which Antichriſt is known, Is the taking out of the way that which hindered.

5. *Antichriſt* is ſet forth by the *removens prohibens*, by the taking that which hindred out of the way; the τὸ κατέχον, v. 6. and ὁ κατέχων ἐκ μέσου γένηται, v. 7. There was ſomething that hindred the Revelation of the Man of Sin, which was to be removed. The Man of Sin could not be brought forth into the World till the *Roman* Empire was taken out of the way, then that wicked One the Pope did riſe up to that height, then Antichriſt did appear in his colours. There is a great conſent a-mong the Ancients as to this thing; and *Jerome* was ſo clear and con-fident in this thing, that as ſoon as he heard of the taking of *Rome* by *Alarick*, he preſently expected the coming of Antichriſt. See *Tertul. l.* 4. *de Reſur. c.* 24. *Ambroſ. in Comment. in Ezek. Chryſoſt. Com. in loc. Auguſt. l.* 19. *de Civ. Dei, c.* 20. Among the Ancients they were ſo confident of this thing that the Church did pray in her Liturgy, That the *Roman*

Empire

Empire might ſtand long, that ſo Antichriſts coming might be long; *Tertullian Apolog.* c.32. 39. So that the *Roman* Empire or Emperour, who was then in poſſeſſion of that Power Imperial, kept out that Papal power which grew out of its Ruins. Κατέχων, is the ſame as *Poſſidere*, 1 Cor. 7. 30. ὡς μὴ κατέχοντες, ὡς μὴ κατέχοντες, the *Roman* Empire being broken into Ten Kingdoms brought in Antichriſt; ſo *Tertul.* l.4. *de Reſurrect.* c.24. *Paul* did not expreſs the *Roman* Empire by name leſt he ſhould bring a Perſecution upon the Church. *Jerom ad Algaſiam, qu.*11. *Pet. in Molin. Vale.* ſhews in ſeveral Inſtances how the *Roman* Emperours did keep the Biſhop of *Rome* from growing to that height, as he did upon their being removed out of the way.

Others take it to be meant of the *Roman* Emperour himſelf, and not of the *Roman* Empire at all; for the *Roman* is not taken out of the way, but ſtands on two legs, *viz.* the Empire of *Turks*, and the Empire of *Germany*. It was the Emperour himſelf, which was *Conſtantine* the Great, who removed to *Conſtantinople*, then the τὸ κατέχον was taken away, The Grandeur of the Emperour and of Antichriſt could not ſtand together. Aſſoon as the Emperour departed from *Rome*, Antichriſt began to be revealed. For when all the Biſhops in the Chriſtian World did meet at the Council of *Nice*, the Biſhop of *Rome* (though requeſted by a Letter) came not, he pretended old age, and the weakneſs of his Body: But *Bellarmine* telleth us the true reaſon was, it was not meet the Head ſhould follow the Members, but rather that the Members ſhould follow the Head; and if the Emperour were preſent, it is likely he would ſit above the Pope, which was not meet, he being the Spiritual Head; therefore he did abſent himſelf. *Cotton* on 1 *Joh.* 2. 18. Though they differ as to the Emperour and Empire, to be that which hindred, yet they agree as to the Pope, that he roſe to his height upon the removal of the one or the other out of the way.

6. By the Myſtery of Iniquity which doth attend his riſe and reign.

6. By the notion of a Myſtery, as it ſtands in oppoſition to the *Myſtery of Godlineſs*, v.7. the Apoſtle following the *Hebrew* way of expreſſion, μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας, i.e. *Doctrina improba vel Myſterium improbum*, a wicked Doctrine or Myſtery; for the whole Religion of Popery as to Faith and Worſhip is ſo contrived by them as may moſt conduce to the ſuſtaining and advancement of the Popes Power, and the gain and profit of the Clergy; There we find that to be written in the forehead of the Whore, (*Rev.* 17. 5.) μυστήριον, as a principal part of her Name. Such is the helliſh contrivance of the whole Body of the Religion of the Papacy, (in which Satan never ſhewed himſelf ſo notorious an Impoſtor, and Angel of Darkneſs, though under the appearance of an Angel of Light) that it gained upon the whole World exceedingly by the Pope, Satans Vicar, ſet forth by the Lamb with two Horns, *Rev.* 13. 11. Who hath prevailed with all ſorts of men to receive the Mark of the Beaſt, and bow to his Image; v.12, 13, 14. The Religion of Antichriſt is carried on in a ſubtle cunning way, elſe it

could not be called a Myſtery, and a Myſtery of Iniquity under the pretence of Godlineſs; the great factors in this Myſtery are ſaid to be ſeducers that ſpeak Lies in hypocriſie, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. *who have* μόρφωσιν, *a form of piety*, which is the mantle to cover the blackeſt abominations, 2 *Tim.* 3. 1, 5. And *Peter* ſpeaking of ſuch Myſtical Villanies, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1, 2, 3. tells us how privily they ſhould bring in damnable Hereſies under the colour of truth. The Religion of Popery which is meerly to advance the honour and grandeur, profit and intereſt of the Pope and his Hierarchy, under a pretence of ſetting up the name and honour of Chriſt, have by their Myſtical art, and cunning fair plauſible deportment, undermined and overthrown the Religion of Chriſt up and down the World. *Chamier l.16. c.8.* treating about Antichriſt, and ſhewing how by their cunning, Hereſies are made ſubſervient to him; ſaith thus, *Hæc vero ſi aliqua eſt Antichriſti nota; dicam audaciter, aut nullum eſſe Antichriſtum, aut Epiſcopum Rom. eum eſſe:* This is a ſpecial note of Antichriſt; I'le ſpeak boldly, That either there is no Antichriſt, or the Biſhop of *Rome* is he.

7. By the Stupendious manner of his coming.

7. *By the manner of his coming*, v. 9, 10. his coming, *i.e.* after he is revealed, and that which hindred is taken out of the way; his coming together with the influences that it had on the World, and ſuch as periſh. He cometh κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῦ Σατανᾶ, *i.e.* Satan will put forth his utmoſt skill in working Miracles by Antichriſt. 2. ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει, καὶ σημείοις, *i. e.* his power to work after a wonderful manner, which God is pleaſed ſometime to grant even to the worſt of men. He ſhall work Signs or Miracles, for Signs are taken ſo here. 3. *Omnis potentia* it is to be taken for *varia potentia*, or a power to work variouſly. 4. Τέρασι ψευδῦς, an *Hebraiſm*, according to the letter *prodigiis mendacii*, lying wonders, or wonderful lies. 5. ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ τ ἀδικίας, ἐν *pro* μετὰ *vel* διὰ, *with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs*; there is a double *Hebraiſm* ſaith *Piſcator*, *Unus in ſignificatione Synecdochica vocabuli injuſtitiæ pro falſitate ſeu mendacio; alter in uſu nominis ejuſdem, quod, cum ſubſtantivum ſit, hic vim habet epitheti.* Under the name of unrighteouſneſs is covered all manner of falſhood and lies, by which they do deceive many, and would deceive the very Elect if they could, *Mat.* 24. 24. Then 5. ἐνέργεια τῆς πλάνης, for πλάνη ἐνέργεια, *i.e.* ἐνεργοῦσα, *Hypallage Heb.* We render *ſtrong deluſion*, or the *deluſion of Antichriſt working ſtrongly*, ſpecially coming under a Judicial tradition from God. This Advent or coming of Antichriſt here mentioned is not to be referred to his firſt Revelation only, but to his full Revelation, when his Kingdom and Government ſhall be ſet up in its ſplendor and power.

He ſhall come with all the power of Satan. Satan is moſt famous for two things, he is *Mordax & homicida*, Joh. 8.44. for he is an adverſary to Divine Authority, and Mans Salvation; and both theſe are eminently ſeen in the Pope, for he hath brought in falſe Doctrines, falſe Wor-

ſhip,

ſhip, and a falſe Religion into the Church; and by this means he is the great murderer of Souls, for they are damned that follow his Deluſions, as appears in the Text. Satan ſhews himſelf a lyar when he puts men on a falſe Idolatrous Worſhip inſtead of a true; ſo all Idolaters are lyars, *Rom.* 1.25. *They changed the truth of God into a lie, &c.* and therefore Idols are called lies, *Amos* 2.4. ſo Idolaters are ſaid, *to make lies their refuge, as under falſhood to hide themſelves.* But Satan never did impoſe ſuch a lye on the World as in the Idolatrous Worſhip of *Rome*; there Idolaters and Lyars are put together, *Rev.* 21.8. and 27. he that worketh abymination and a lye, they are put together; and *Chap.* 22. 15. Idolaters and makers of lyes are put together again.

Cum omni potentia; ſome take it of the power of both Swords, Eccleſiaſtical and Secular, which the Pope claims, but it rather reſpecteth that faculty and power which the Pope the two Horned-Beaſt, *Rev.* 13. 12, 13, *&c.* doth pretend to, and whereby he doth work Wonders: The Signs and Wonders here ſpoken of, are the ways and means, and weapons which Satan uſeth by Antichriſt to deceive perſons to their deſtruction; this was the way which Satan took by *Jannes* and *Jambres* to deceive *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians*, 2 *Tim.* 3.8. theſe were a kind of types of Seducers which were to come in theſe laſt times.

That this may appear to be a Character of Antichriſt, the Papiſts themſelves do grant that Antichriſt is to be confirmed with Signs and Wonders, *Suarez Apol. lib.* 1. *c.* 17. *num.* 12. *Bellarm. de Pont. Rom. l.* 3. *c.* 15. *Sanders de Antichriſto, Dem.* 19, 20, 21, 22. If then the Popes coming be by Signs and lying Wonders, then he will come under that mark of Antichriſt by their own confeſſions.

That Miracles have been at the firſt promulgation of the Scripture is moſt true for the confirmation of the Divine Authority of it, & increaſing a belief of the Doctrine of Chriſt; but after that the Goſpel is promulgated, there is no further uſe of Miracles: And therefore when the Scripture doth ſpeak of Miracles and Miracle-mongers as here; and *Mar.* 13.22. and *Rev.* 13. 13. *Mat.* 7.22. it is to be underſtood of falſe Chriſts and falſe Prophets, who ſhall come in the name of Chriſt, and ſhall pretend to marvelous things in his name, and ſhall deceive many, and this is here brought in as a ſpecial mark of Antichriſt.

That this Mark is fulfilled in the Papacy, doth appear from themſelves, who boaſt very much of their Miracles, and the advancement of their Religion, and the confirmation of it by Miracles. The Legends of their Saints are full of Miracles, of St. *Dominick*, St. *Francis*, Saint *Benedict*, and the Images of the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints in their Calendar; ſuch Miracles are called lying Miracles: 1. Becauſe they are for the confirmation of falſe Doctrines, of Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Adoration of Images, and Relicks, &c. Prayers for the Dead, and the Popes Supremacy, &c. 2. Becauſe many of them are things meerly feigned to be done which were never

done, or if they were done, they have been brought about by the meer artifice of Satan, who is able to do things beyond the reach of men, by which he deceives ſuch as will be deceived. 3. From the end of theſe Miracles which is to deceive men, *Mar.* 13. 22. and here in the Text they are framed by ſeducers for ſeduction, and ſuch as will not receive the truth with that love of it: v. 1. *They came with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs in them that periſh.*

Their own Authors have ſet down multitudes of Miracles: *Baron.* in his *Annals*: The conformities of St. *Francis*, the Golden Legend of *Jacobus de Voragine*, the Sermons of *Dormi ſecure*, the Hiſtory of our Lady by *Lipſius*, and *Bellarm. de Officio Principis*, l. 3. with ſeveral others. So that by all this you ſee this note will agree to the Antichriſtian ſtate of the Papacy.

8. By his fatal Ruin.

8. *He is ſet out by his fatal ruin, and utter deſtruction*, v. 8. Here be two parts of this verſe. 1. The firſt looks back on the verſe before, which ſpeaks of the time of Antichriſts coming upon the removal of what hindred; this we have done with. But 2. this latter part points at the ruin of Antichriſt, and how he ſhall be deſtroyed. The former part had reſpect to our Inſtruction, the latter is for our Conſolation in the downfall of ſo great and publick an Enemy.

He ſets down the principal efficient cauſe of his ruin, and that is Chriſt at his coming: when Chriſt comes to ſet up his Kingdom, and to take to him his great Power and Reign, then he will deſtroy Antichriſt; *Dan.* 2. 44. & 7. 14, 28. ſpecially under the fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh Vials, *Rev.* 16. from *v.* 10. to the end. You have the deſtruction of the Whore, *chap.* 18. the overthrow of the Beaſt and falſe Prophet, *ch.* 19. from 17. to the end; then you have the binding of Satan and the reign of the Saints on the Earth, *ch.* 20. 1, 2, &c.

2. You have the inſtrumental cauſe, *the ſpirit of his mouth.* Here be two words to be conſidered, 1. Ἀναλώσει, *conſumere*, which notes his gradual conſumption by the preaching of the Goſpel, *Iſa.* 11. 4. this is the Sword out of his mouth, *Rev.* 19. 15. By this Sword Chriſt doth ſmite the Nations; his conſumption is gradual as was his riſing, which was under the Trumpets, and his fall is under the Vials: the Preachers of the Goſpel have been waſting, wounding and conſuming him, ſpecially ſince the Angels with open mouth did declare againſt him, *Rev.* 14. 6, 7, 8, 9. The Miniſters of the Goſpel ſince the Reformation began, have diſcovered the Whoredoms, Impoſtures, and falſe Doctrines of *Rome*, and the danger of having communion with *Rome*, and the deſperate condition of ſuch as will not ſeparate from her, *v.* 9, 10. Many a deadly wound have they given to Antichriſt; ſo that he hath been waſting like a Snail, as *Pſal.* 58. 8. till he ſhall come to nothing; not by might, nor by power, *Rev.* 4. 6, 7. but by the Word which he hath pretended to riſe by, he ſhall be deſtroyed. 2. Here is καταργήσει, which notes his utter deſtruction, by the brightneſs of Chriſts coming, when he

he shall come to take to him his great Power, at the sounding of the seventh Trumpet, *Rev.* 11. 15. The Text must be considered under a double Capacity, 1, As to his Ecclesiastical state, and in his Spiritual Capacity as he is set forth under the notion of a Whore, and false Prophet, and so shall be consumed by the preaching of the Word, and the Sword of the Spirit; and this hath been doing these many years, and the work is still carrying on by the Ministers of the Word. 2. He must be considered in his Politick Secular Capacity, consisting of several Kingdoms under one supream Head, which is the Pope; so he is set out by the notion of the Beast, *Rev.* 11. 7. & *ch.* 13. 1, 2, 3. which Beast, the Whore, *i.e.* the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of *Rome* rideth, *Rev.* 17. 3. yet they both together make up but one Antichrist, as the Horse and Man both together makes up but one Horseman. Now Antichrist as to his Secular Capacity, he shall be destroyed with another Sword, *Rev.* 13. 10. *He that killeth with the sword shall be killed with the sword.* So that the utter consumption both of the Beast and Whore shall be upon the little stones rising into a great Mountain, which shall smite the Image on his feet, and shall break it to pieces, *Dan.* 2. 34, 35. This little stone is the Kingdom of Christ, which hath been but *Regnum Lapidis* hitherto, but then shall be *Regnum Montis*.

Perhaps it will be said, That the destruction of Antichrist (as hath been shewed) can be no mark of Antichrist, by which he may be known, for all Enemies shall be destroyed by Christ and by his Word.

It is true that Christ will destroy all his Enemies by his Word which cometh out of his mouth, *Rev.* 19. 15. Sin and the Devil are continually destroying by the Word; but since Antichrist is set forth as the greatest enemy that ever was, and since the Antichristian state of it as it is in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of *Rome*, together with the Beast, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2, *&c.* are the last edition of the Fourth Monarchy, and it is on its last legs in this state, and it hath most opposed the Kingdom of Christ beyond any other; therefore the destruction of this State as to the remarkableness of it shall go beyond all other States and Kingdoms in the World. And therefore it is, that the Vials are prepared for this Enemy in a more special manner beyond all others, *Rev.* 15. 1, 2, *&c.* and *ch.* 16. the seven Angels with the seven Vials pour them forth upon the Beast, or something of the Beast. Thus much hath been made good in the Papacy in a great measure already, which may appear by the confession of *Bellarmine*, who telleth us, (*Lib. Pont. de Rom.* 3. *c.* 21.) That the *Lutheran* Heresie possessed almost all *Germany*, *Denmark*, *Norway*, *Suevia*, *Gothia*, *Hungaria*, *Pannonia*, *France*, *England*, *Scotland*, *Polonia*, *Bohemia*, and *Helvetia*, and is got over the *Alps* into *Italy*. From his confession you may perceive what a Consumption there hath been made of Antichrist.

9. Antichrist may be known by his Followers, and the Livery which they wear, the black marks and brands upon their backs, *v.* 10, 11, 12.

9. By his Followers and Retinue, and their Livery.

Here

Here is a damned crew, the Retinue and Followers of Antichrist, having this special mark on them, that they be such as shall perish. Their Properties are 1. Negative, *They received not the love of the truth that they might be saved.* 2. Affirmative, *they have pleasure in unrighteousness.* 3. They are set forth by some passive Properties which are penalties. 1. Internal, *v.* 11. *strong delusions to believe a lye.* 2. Eternal, *v.* 12. *Damnation*; here be the black marks of Reprobation, by which Antichrists Retinue and Followers are set forth. We do not find that any party of men are under more dreadful marks of Gods hatred than Antichrists Followers. See *Rev.* 13. 8. there they be set out by the Stigma of Reprobation, as persons left out of the Book of Life. And *chap.* 14. 9, 10, 11. *They that worship the Beast, and receive his mark in their forehead, and in their hand, they shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, &c. and be tormented with fire and brimstone, &c.* And *chap.* 17. 8. there the admirers of the Beast are such as are left out of the Book of Life: The same persons are described here by *Paul.* 4. They are set forth by a special act of God in a way of just Judgment toward them; *i.e.* his sending strong Delusions to believe lies, by a Judicial Tradition, and giving of them up to a spirit of falshood to their eternal perdition. All these which are followers of Antichrist, that wonder after the Beast, and receive his mark, and bow to his Image, who close with Popish false Doctrines instead of the true; the Holy Spirit expresseth them by ἀπ ἤλεγτο, *v.* 10. i.e. *Pertinaciter oblatum repudiarunt, est Metaph.* Beza. They are such as wilfully reject the true Doctrine and Worship of Christ, and pertinaciously adhere to the false Doctrine, and the Idolatrous Worship of the Pope: And moreover they please themselves much in those false ways of unrighteousness, which are most destructive to Souls, and most displeasing to God.

From all this it appears that the Pope is Antichrist. Indeed if but some one or few Particulars did meet on the Pope or Papacy, we could not argue from them that he were the Antichrist, but when they all meet in the Papacy, and generally by common consent of Orthodox Writers they fasten these marks upon the Pope, he will never be able by all the skill he hath to escape the vengeance of God which will follow him on that account. Dr. *Whitaker* writing against Antichrist, and proving the Pope to be the Antichrist, he names many eminent and learned men that have understood this place, and those others in *Daniel* and the *Revelation*, of the Pope. He tells us of *Wicklife* (who declared the Pope to be Antichrist) who was *suo seculo doctissimus.* And *Luther* affirms in his Writings the Pope to be Antichrist: He saith he is *potissimus Antichristus*, and that abomination of Desolation that stands in the Holy place. *Papa ille est Antichristus, cum sit specialis procurator Diaboli, &c. Non solum simplex illa persona, sed multitudo papurum a tempore defectionis Ecclesiæ, Cardinalium, Episcoporum, & suorum complurium aliorum, est Antichristi persona composita, monstrosa, &c.* Catalog. Testium Verit. He adds that

that he was a man, *Spiritu Prophetico & dono interpretandi Scripturas preditus admirabili.* Then followed *Peter Martyr, Bucer, Bullinger, Melanction, Brentius, Calvin, Oecolampadius, Muſculus, Beza, Gualter, Illyricus, Danus, Junius, Gabriel Powzol, Philip Morney, George Pacardus* in *Deſcriptione Antichriſti, Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis, Rivet, Crakenthorp, Tilenus, Chamier,* Biſhop *Uſher* in a Letter to Archbiſhop *Laud,* 1635. All agree in this Theſis, That the Pope is Antichriſt. And *Zanchy* though he differed ſomewhat from his Brethren in this point, yet he ſaith in his *Miſcellanies, Regnum Papæ, non nego eſſe Regnum Antichriſti.* And he thinks that the Pope is pointed in 2 *Theſ.* 2. As for our *Engliſh* men we have many that have publickly teſtified the Pope to be Antichriſt, as Mr. *Fox* in his *Martyrology* hath noted. The learned Martyr *Walter Brute* maintained it in a large Diſcourſe. *Richard Wimbleton* in a Sermon preached at *Pauls* Croſs 1389. Sir *Geofry Chaucer* in his Plow-mans Tale. *Lucifers* Letters to the Prelats of *England,* ſuppoſed to be written by *William Swinderly* Martyr. *William Tyndal* a godly Martyr in his *Obedience of a Chriſtian man.* The Author of a *very Chriſtian Biſhop and a counterfeit Biſhop,* 1538. *John Bale* Biſhop of *Oſyris* in his *Image of both* Churches, *& templorum illuſtriam Britanniæ.* Mr. *Latimer,* Mr. *Bilney,* Mr. *Rogers, Sletterdon* and others, Martyrs. *William Abbey* Biſhop of *Exeter* in his poor mans Library. Biſhop *Jemel* in his Defence of the Apology of the Church of *England.* Mr. *Tho. Beacon* in his Acts of Chriſt and Antichriſt, and Mr. *Fox* in his Meditations on the *Apocalypſis.* Mr. *Brightman* on the *Apocalypſis.* Biſhop *Bilſon* in his Book of Chriſtian Subjection, and Unchriſtian Rebellion. Dr. *Robert Abbot* Biſhop of *Sarum,* Dr. *George Downham* Biſhop of *Derry,* Dr. *Beard,* Dr. *Willet,* Dr. *Fulk,* Dr. *Sutcliffe,* Dr. *Sharp,* Mr. *Squire,* in their ſeveral Treatiſes concerning Antichriſt: Archbiſhop *Cranmer* did avow publickly the Pope to be Antichriſt: Archbiſhop *Parker* and *Grindal* avowed the ſame: Archbiſhop *Whitgift* when he Commenced Doctor at the Divinity-Act 1569, publickly maintained in the Schools, that *Papa eſt ille Antichriſtus:* And Archbiſhop *Abbot* aſſerted the ſame, with many others of our *Engliſh* Divines, who have generally held and declared the Pope to be Antichriſt.

Haud equidem credo quemquam juſtum eſſe bonumque. Cui Papa non ſordet manifeſtus ut Antichriſtus.

I might add the Convocation in *Ireland* 1615, the Parliament of *England* 3 *Jacobi*; the Synod of *Gape* in *France,* ſeveral Statutes of 16 *R.*2. *c.*5; 25 *Hen.*8. *c.* 19, 20, 21, 28. *Hen.*8. *c.*10. 37. *Hen.*8. 17. they tacitely define the Pope to be the Antichriſt. Then our Book of Homilies, ſecond part in the Sermon for *Whiteſunday,* and in the ſixth Sermon againſt wilful Rebellion determine the Pope to be Antichriſt. The Book of Common-Prayer for the Fifth of *November,* ſtileth the Pope, Papiſts, and Jeſuits a *Babyloniſh,* Antichriſtian Sect. The Author of the Book called *Euſebius Captivus,* who declared againſt the Pope as the Antichriſt to his face, when he was brought before him to be arraigned. *Archuſius de ortu Antichriſti, Philip Nicolai, Chriſtopher. Peret.*

Penuery.

Peucer, &c. have faſtened the title of Antichriſt on the Pope. We find in ſtory ſeveral times loud out-crys of the birth of Antichriſt, and ſtill their eyes were upon the Pope. *An.* 1106. *Prepergentis* tells us that Pope *Paſchalis* was going a Journey into *France* there to hold a Council, and he heard in his Journey, that it was the common report that Antichriſt was born; whereupon he ſtops his Journey and ſtaid at *Florence*, but afterwards he went his Journey, deſpiſing the report, as coming from contemptible fellows: Though *Baronius* tells us, They were perſons of no ordinary note who did report it. See *Bernard* Epiſt. 56. *ad Gaud. fridum. Carnoteus*, *Epiſt. Sabellic. Ennead.* 9. *c.*4. tells us of Prodigies that appeared about that time in the Heavens, a Camel of vaſt magnitude, and in the Sea which over-flowed the ſhore an hundred paces: thereupon it was that the Biſhop of *Florence* ſaid, that Antichriſt was born then in the year 1120. There was a Treatiſe ſet forth in the name of ſome faithful ſervants of Chriſt concerning Antichriſt, in which all perſons are awakened to conſider of Antichriſt, which was manifeſt in their age in the Pope and Papacy; thereupon many did ſeparate from the Church of *Rome*: See *Bernard* Hom. 65, 66, in *Cant.* Between the year 1160, and 1170, the world being awakened as with a publick Herald ſounding a Trumpet about Antichriſts then appearing, cauſed a very great ſeparation of the *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes* from the Church of *Rome*. By all theſe Teſtimonies it appears what a general agreement there is and hath been among all that have had a ſavour of the true Religion upon their hearts; they have ſtill agreed in this, though they have differed in other points, That the Pope is Antichriſt.

From what hath been ſaid there be ſeveral things may be drawn by way of Inference, for our practice and inſtruction.

1 *Infer.* From what hath been ſaid we may ſee a reaſon of the miſtakes of ſome in their proving the Man of Sin to be the Antichriſt, and the Pope to be the Man of Sin, from ſome places which do not ſo properly belong to it. They have thought the ſame Antichriſt to be pointed at in *Johns* Epiſtles, 1 *Joh.* 2: 18, 22. and 1 *Joh.* 4. 3: and 2 *Joh.* 7. as here in *Pauls* Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*: Some think the ſame Antichriſt to be ſet forth by *John*, as by *Daniel*, and *Paul*, and by *John* in the *Revelations*, who deciphers Antichriſt under the notion of a Beaſt, and a Whore, and a falſe Prophet. The Antichriſt pointed at by *John* in his Epiſtles hath relation rather to the prediction of Chriſt, *Mat.* 24. 11, 23, 24. *Mar.* 13. 21, 22. *There ſhall ariſe falſe Chriſts, &c.* We have not the name Antichriſt but only in *John*, indeed we have ὁ ἀντιχριστος *v.*4. a word equivalent: *John* ſpeaks of an Antichriſt who was then in the World, and one propheſied of by Chriſt to come ſpeedily into the World. But *Paul* writes of one who was wholly to come into the World, and for whoſe coming there were great obſtacles to be removed firſt.

first. The Antichrists coming in *John* is immediately upon a time which is called ἐσχάτη ὥρα, 1 *Joh.* 2. 18. And we know that since he is come, it is the last hour or last time. This cannot refer to the last time which respecteth the coming of Christ to judg the World: This last hour doth refer to the Jewish state, of which the last glass or hour was now running and their final desolation was at hand. Then there were several who did pretend to be Christ, and to come in his name; there was *Simon Magus*, and *Carpocrates*, and the *Gnosticks*, of whom they were the heads which did pretend to *Miracles*, and *Enthusiasms*, and did seduce many. These be the Antichrists *John* speaks of in his Epistles, which were to appear, at the Coming of the Lord to Judgment; I do not mean his last Coming to the Judgment of the World, but of his Coming to the final destruction of *Jerusalem*, and the Jewish Polity and Nation by *Vespasian*: of which Coming *Paul* speaks, *Heb.* 10. 25. That was the day approaching in which Christ came to destroy that people: It is mentioned by *James* 5. 7, 8. which did draw nigh, for then the Lord Jesus was coming against *Jerusalem*. From the misunderstanding of these places, and misapplying them to wrong purposes, hath arisen the misapprehensions of the Pope's being Antichrist; for though several things in those places in *John*'s Epistles do agree to the Papacy, yet the proper description of Antichrist is to be looked after in *Paul's* Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, &c. and in the *Revelation*, and in *Daniel*.

2 *Infer.* If the Pope be The Antichrist set forth by those bloody characters (as hath been seen); if this Body Politick, Head and Members, be the Antichristian state, and this state is the Papacy, then it cannot be the true Church: It is true, Antichrist, Head and Members, are the counterfeit of the true Church, and of Christ the Head, and therefore they cannot be the true Church. The Scripture still sets out the Antichristian state in a flat opposition to the true, yet still under a pretence and colour of Faith in, and Love to Christ: For Antichristianism is, *mystica impietas, pietatis nomine palliata*: A mystical impiety, under the cloke of piety; so the *Glosse*. The false Church whereof the Pope is the Head, is set forth by a double Beast, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2,---11, 12. Both which together make up one Catholick Roman Papal Church, the number of whose name is *666*, *vers.* 18. And the true Church, whereof Christ is the Head, is set forth by 144000, *chap.* 14. 1. the Square-root being 12. built on 12 Apostles: But 25 is the Square-root of *666*, and there is a Fraction in the Root, and one more too there in the Square-root; to let us know, that though the Antichristian Church may seem as fair to such as look on it with human eyes, and *666*, runs as handsomly as 144; but the former is the number of a Man, the whole Church and her Religion, being made up of additions and inventions of men. The number *666*, denotes the Apostacy of the Church from the Standard of Truth. The Square-root of the Apostolick Church being 12, and so the Apostacy lies generally in additions to the Root and Foundation of

Mr. *Potter* in his 666.

the Christian Religion; they do not rest satisfied in fundamentals of the Christian Religion delivered by the 12 Apostles. The false Church is set forth by the Whore, who pretends to be the Spouse of Christ, but is opposite to the Virgin-company, *Rev.* 14. 4. that follow the Lamb. The Ecclesiastical state of *Rome*, or Hierarchy, is set forth by the false Prophet, *Rev.* 16. 13, &c. 19. 20. & 20. 10. in a flat opposition to the two Prophets, *Rev.* 11. 10. which are the same with two Witnesses, and two Olive-trees, and two Candlesticks, *vers.* 3, 4. These represent the true Ministry of Christ which did prophesie, *vers.* 6. till they finished their Testimony, *vers.* 7. Now whereas it is said that they are a true Church, *veritate entitatis*, but not *Moris*; they yield the Cause, because the question is not whether they be true and real men and women which are members of the Church of *Rome*; but whether they be members rightly qualified, as to their moral, and supernatural Principles which makes them a true Church?

How can that be a true Church, whose Head is the Man of Sin, &. who hath all those black and hellish characters belonging to him? Such a Church cannot be founded on the 12 Apostles; Therefore that cannot be a true Church, which hath the *Abaddon* and *Apollyon* for the Heads. How can that be a true Church, which is so opposite to the true Church both Head and Members?

3. *Inference.* If the Papal Antichristian state, be such a Body, Head and Members (as hath been shewed) then we may hence learn, 1. our Danger, 2. our Duty. 1. Our Danger if we continue in that Church. It must needs be a very dangerous thing for any to continue a member of that Church, or to have Communion with her: Such are under the energetical Influence and Seduction of Satan, and the Judicial Tradition of God, that since they reject the truth in the love of it, they are given up to believe a lye, that they may be damned. They are under the most dreadful commination, *Rev.* 14. 9, 10, 11. They are a people marked out for utter destruction, as being rejected by him, *Rev.* 13. 8, and 17. 8. 2. We may learn our Duty to make haste out of that Church. All such as keep up Communion with *Rome*, let them hearken to that Call, *Rev.* 18. 4. *Come out of her*, &c. The Argument is taken from the Danger; this separation is no Schism, it being a separation from that Church, which is Apostatized from the Faith, and Truth of Christ. As soon as ever the people of God came to be awakened, and that the light of the Gospel began to spring forth, they presently saw their danger if they continued in that Church, and immediately performed their duty, and departed from her.

4. *Inference.* If the Papal Antichristian state be such a Body as hath been shewed, then it should be seriously considered, how any living and dying in the Faith and Religion of that Church can be saved, *Rev.* 16. 3. Every living Soul died in that *Sea* of Ordinances (as some take it) of that Church, which is *as the Blood of a dead man*; as it

was

was (*Exod.* 7. 17, 18.) when the Rivers were turned into Blood, all the Fiſh died. The whole Religion of the Antichriſtian Church is made up of falſe Doctrines, idolatrous Worſhip, ſuperſtitious Ceremonies, Traditions, and Inventions of men, by which they make void the Law of God, *Matt.* 15. 6. and ſubvert the Truth of the Goſpel. How any (holding their Religion as it is ſo formed by the Man of Sin) can be ſaved in it, I cannot ſee. In all the deſcription of the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, there is nothing that hath any tendency to Salvation: Look on the Church of *Rome* and her Hierarchy as ſhe is ſet forth by the Spirit of God, and it is ſtill ſet forth in the moſt black and odious colours of a Beaſt with ſeven Heads and ten Horns, and by a Beaſt with two Horns like a Lamb, but ſpeaks like a Dragon; *Rev.* 13. 1, 2, & 11, 12, &c. And by the great Whore that rideth the Beaſt, *Rev.* 17. 1, 2, and 5, 6. Here is nothing but miſchief and ruine to Souls from this Church, as ſet out by thoſe Types, as alſo under the notion of a falſe Prophet, and Seducer of the Souls of people to their Perdition. Some of the Church of *Rome* have much doubted, whether the Pope and Cardinals (which are the Head and Pillars of their Church) ſhall any of them be ſaved. *Boccatius* brings in a Monk ſaying thus: *Papas & Cardinales, & Epiſcopos non pervenire ad ſalutem per doctrinam iſtam, quam palam videmus, eos ſervare; ſed aliam habere penes ſe, quam clanculum obſervant, nec aliis facile communicant: quid potuit verius dici, eos per iſtam, quæ illis eſt in uſu, non poſſe ſervari.* *Boccatius* himſelf, looks on the Pope, and Cardinals, and Biſhops, according to the Doctrine they held forth to the World, as perſons which ſhall never be ſaved; unleſs as the Monk ſaith, they have ſome other Doctrine which they keep to themſelves, in which they look for Salvation: He on all their Religion to be a meer Shew and Pageantry, and refined Paganiſm. I'le propound but an Argument or two to confirm this *Inference*.

1. They which lay the main ſtreſs of their Religion, on the rotten foundation of the Univerſal Headſhip of the Pope, and do believe it as an Article of their Faith, they cannot build their eternal Salvation upon ſuch a weak foundation; there being no other foundation but that which is laid, Chriſt Jeſus, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11, 12. But ſo do they of the Church of *Rome*, they built their Religion on this foundation of the Headſhip of the Pope, to whom they give what peculiarly belongs to Chriſt, with Supremacy, Soveraignty, Univerſality, and Infallibility. They which rob Chriſt of his Crown and Jewels, and put them on the Popes *triple* Crown for him to wear, and lay the greateſt weight on this buſineſs, they cannot be ſaved while they reſt there; But ſo do the Papiſts: Therefore &c. *The Pope ſits in the temple of God, as God*, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4. and he is believed to have thoſe excellencies which belong to Chriſt. *Bellarmine* ſaith, The Pope is the Univerſal Spouſe of the Church: And *Auguſt. Beroius* ſaith, He is is the foundation of Faith,

the Cauſe of Cauſes, and Lord of Lords. And *Baldus* ſaith, He is the living fountain of all righteouſneſs, *&c.*

2. They which believe as an Article of their Religion, that the Church, or the Head of it is above the Scripture (as hath been ſhewn before, and by my Brethren in their diſcourſes) they cannot be ſaved in that way; becauſe no Man can know certainly, where his Salvation is to be had, ſince it is (by their Tenets) in the Power of the Pope, to alter or add, as he ſhall think fit. The Pope ſet out by the two-Horned Beaſt, that ſpeaks like a Dragon, *Rev.* 13. 11. and is the ſame with the falſe Prophet, he takes to him the Authority of Chriſt, and more than Chriſt doth exerciſe, to make new Articles of Faith, to ſet up a new Worſhip in the Church, and to impoſe it upon all upon pain of death, baniſhment, excommunication, *Rev.* 13. 11, 12, 13, *&c.* This Beaſt which repreſents the Hierarchy of *Rome*, exerciſeth all the Power of the firſt Beaſt, *verſ.* 12. which was given him by the Dragon: *verſ.* 4. So that he is Satans Lieutenant and Vicar-General, eſpecially in taking ſuch a Power and Authority above the Scripture; and this muſt be believed as an Article of their Faith. Let ſuch conſider, how they can be ſaved in that Religion.

3. That Church which is caſt off of God and muſt not be meaſured, as refuſing to come under the Rule of the Word, is ſuch which none can be ſaved in; But ſuch is the Church of *Rome*, *Rev.* 11. 2, 3. There is that Church (*i. e.* Head and Members, and all the Offices, and Ordinances, Inſtitutions, Doctrine, Worſhip and Government) are all caſt out, as falſe, as having no Authority, or the Stamp of Chriſt upon them: Though they will plead an Intereſt in Chriſt, as *Mat.* 7. 22. yet Chriſt will utterly diſown them; though they will cry the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, *&c.* yet they are caſt out, and given to the Gentiles to be troden under foot by the Gentiles. In regard that *Rome* having Apoſtatized from the Religion, and pure Worſhip of Chriſt, hath brought into the Church and publick Worſhip thereof, Pagan Idolatry under new names, of worſhipping of Angels, and Saints, or Dæmons, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. That Church which is thus caſt off of God, and his pure Worſhip is caſt off by them, as being like the Man of Sin, or being the Man of Sin, Head and Members; I do not ſee how Salvation is to be had in that Church as ſuch, thus diſallowed by God, as you have heard: Therefore it is that the Churches of Chriſt have caſt her off; and as Biſhop *White* in his anſwer to the Jeſuit, ſaith, we have caſt off the Pope, and his Teaching, for no other Cauſe, but that we are aſſured he is Antichriſt, and his Faith is Hereſie. If their whole Church and Worſhip be caſt out by God, as being under no Scripture-Rule; then the true Religion, true Faith, true Worſhip, are not to be looked for in them, and by conſequence, the Salvation of Souls is not to be expected from them.

5. *Infer.*

5. *Infer.* If the Pope or the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy of *Rome*, be that Antichriſtian ſtate which you have heard ſet forth, and there is a Myſtery of Iniquity in their Religion and Worſhip, and they are under ſuch black marks of reprobation, that do joyn with them in Communion, then it is fit that all Chriſtians ſhould be acquainted with the Myſtery of Iniquity in ſome meaſure, and ſhould ſtudy, as the grounds of the true Chriſtian Religion, ſo the ſeeming pretences, and falſe principles, and abominable practices of the Antichriſtian Religion.

1. We ſhould be acquainted with them, leſt we be deceived through ignorance, and overtaken with the devices of Satan; which *Paul* mentioneth, 2 *Cor.* 2. 11. and that we may be delivered from being plunged in the deeps of Satan, ſpoken of *Rev.* 2. 24. Are not the Nations deceived by them? *Rev.* 20. 3. Doth not the World worſhip the Dragon, and bow to the Image of the Beaſt, or receive his Mark, or have the name of the Beaſt, or the number of his Name? *Rev.* 13. 3, 4, 15, 16, 17. Do not the Kings of the earth commit Fornication with the Whore? And are not the Inhabiters of the earth Drunk with the Wine of her fornication? *Rev.* 17. 2. And all this becauſe they do not know the impoſtures of that Church in their Religion. Surely the Spirit of God would not have ſet out this Church under the notion of the Man of Sin, and thoſe ſeveral Beaſts in the *Revelations* and elſewhere; but that it was intended we ſhould know them to avoid them. How expreſs and punctual is *Paul*, in ſetting forth the Apoſtacy of the latter times? 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. He ſets out both the way of their deceits and the inſtruments. 1. He tells us of ſeducing Spirits. 2. The Doctrine of Devils. 3. They ſpeak lies in hypocriſy. 4. They are under a ſeared Conſcience, and care not what they ſay or do, to promote the Holy Catholick Church of *Rome*, as they call her.

2. We ſhould ſtudy their Myſteries, elſe (if we ſhould be called to ſuffer) we ſhall not be able to ſuffer on a clear, and comfortable account, as they *Rev.* 11. 7. and *chap.* 13. 7. They ſuffered becauſe they would not comply with the Man of Sin, in his Religion and Worſhip, nor conform to them, nor have Communion with them, as they did, *Rev.* 13. 3, 4, 14, 15. Thoſe in *verſ.* 7. ſuffered on that account.

3. We muſt know thoſe things, elſe we ſhall not be able to joyn in the Triumphant Song of *Moſes* and the Lamb, upon the pouring forth the Vials on this Antichriſtian ſtate. *They only ſtand on the Sea of Glaſs, having the Harps of God, and ſing the Song of Moſes, and which have gotten the victory over the Beaſt, and over his Image, and over his mark, and over the number of his Name*, *Rev.* 15. 2. they are perſons well ſeen in the deceits and impoſtures of that Church.

4. The Saints and Martyrs could not have born ſo noble a Teſtimony againſt the Man of Sin, in following the Lamb wherever he went, *Rev.* 14. 3, 4. And were and are at open defiance againſt them, declaring their deteſtation of their Religion and Worſhip; *verſ.* 8. 9, 10. un-

unleſs they did well know what they did. Indeed the Papiſts tell us we need not ſearch into thoſe things. The *Rhemiſts* in their *Annotations*, on *Acts* 1. 7. ſay it is not needful to ſearch into the times of Antichriſt, *&c.* But Dr. *Fulk* anſwereth them, that it is neceſſary for us to know the coming of Antichriſt as God hath revealed him. But the Miniſters of Antichriſt would have no enquiry made of him, leſt they ſhould be found in See of *Rome*, the Weſtern *Babylon*; They would have us be ignorant of this point, and keep us in the dark, leſt we ſhould ſee their frauds. *Bellarmine de pontif. Rom. in præfat.* calls that point of the Pope, *ſummam rei Chriſtianæ*, the very ſum of the whole buſineſs of a Chriſtian: And *Malvenda de Antichriſto*, ſaith, he ſtudied that one point twelve years. They count it a point moſt worthy to be ſtudied, but they would keep the World in darkneſs and ignorance; leſt if their Impoſtures ſhould be detected, they would be abhorred, and their whole Religion being found to be a meere Deluſion, it would be an Execration. And that will come to paſs, by the diſcovery of further light of the Goſpel, by which the prodigious enormities of that Church, and the *pudenda* of the Whore will be made manifeſt to all the World; that (I ſay) will come to paſs which is propheſied of, *Rev.* 17. 16. *The ten horns---ſhall hate the whore, and make her deſolate, and naked, and ſhall eat her fleſh, and burn her with fire.* They ſhall Cart her as the mother of abominations, as a common ſtrumpet throughout Chriſtendom.

6. If the Papacy, the Hierarchy of *Rome*, of which the Pope is the Head, be ſuch as hath been deſcribed by *Paul*, then there can be no peace with *Rome*, no Communion with *Rome:* How can there be Peace ſaid *Jehu* to *Joram*, 2 *Kings* 9. 22. as long as the Whoredoms of *Jezebel* are ſo many? What peace can there be with that Church which is the Mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth? *Rev.* 17. 5. What peace can there be with that Body Politick, which is the greateſt enemy of Jeſus Chriſt upon earth? What peace can there be between the followers of the Beaſt, *Rev.* 13. 3, 4, 15, 16, &c. and us adorers and admirers, and the followers of the Lamb? *Rev.* 14. 1, 2, 3, 4. They are flatly oppoſite the one to the other, the one having the mark of the Beaſt in their right hand and foreheads; the other the name of the Father, and of the Lamb (ſo ſome Copies have it) written in their foreheads, who did own and publiſh defiance to each other: So that we may ſay as it is, 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. *What agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols?* And *verſ.* 14. 15. What Communion hath light with darkneſs, Chriſt and *Belial*, Chriſtians and Antichriſtians, Truth and Falſhood, the Church of *Rome* with the Proteſtant Churches together? Biſhop *Hall* in his Book, *No Peace with Rome*, ſaith, Sooner may God create a new *Rome*, than reform the old. There was a reconciliation attempted by the Emperours, *Ferdinand*, and *Maximilian*; and *Caſſander*,

ſander by their appointment drew a Project, in which he ſhewed his judgment, but without ſucceſs. *Conſultat. Caſſandri.* It is ſaid, that at a meeting at *Regenſpurgh*, there was an agreement made touching Free-will, Original Sin, Juſtification, Faith, Merits, Diſpenſations, the Maſs, *&c.* but this held not. *Acta Colloq. Ratisbon. An.* 1541. *Lindan. de quærela pacis, præfat.*

The chief factours of the Church of *Rome*, are bitterly ſet againſt all reconciliation. See *Bellarm. de Grat. & lib. arbit.* He ſaith, that we embrace this opinion ſo much the more willingly, by how much it diſpleaſeth our adverſaries, and eſpecially *Calvin*. And *Maldonat.* in *c. 6. Joh.* was ſo much abhorring from the Religion of the Proteſtants maintained by *Calvin*, that he ſaith, That though what he held was the ſame opinion with *Auſtin* and others of the Fathers, yet he rejected it becauſe it was held by *Calvin*.

7. If theſe things be ſo concerning the Papacy as hath been ſaid, then there is matter of admiration and gratitude to all ſuch whom God hath delivered from compliance with or conformity to, or Communion with that Church, of which the Pope, which is the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, is the Head, *whoſe coming is after the working of Satan &c.* v. 9. Whoſe Members are under his powerful Seduction, and the Judicial Tradition of God to believe a lie to their own *eternal damnation*, v. 10, 11, 12. Their condition muſt needs be moſt dangerous, who are Members of that Church; and therefore it is the greater mercy to be ſaved from that Seduction which thouſands are under, whoſe Names are not written in the *Lambs book of life*, Rev. 13. 8. & 17. 8. They are under the black notes of Reprobation: To be ſaved from being of their Communion who worſhip the Beaſt, or his Image, and to be of that company of the Hundred forty-four thouſand who are Virgins, and follow the Lamb where ever he goes, is worthy of eternal Praiſes. When we find ſuch as are under the Seduction of the Man of Sin, the falſe Prophet, and the Whore, to be under the moſt fearful comminations from God, *Rev.* 14. 9, 10, 11. how they that drink of the Wrath of God, and in the preſence of the Lord and his holy Angels for ever and ever; Is it not matter of very great admiration and praiſes, that we ſhould be ſaved from their ſin, and ſo delivered from their plagues.

8. If the Church of *Rome*, of which the Pope is the Head, be ſuch a Body, ſo corrupt and abominable as hath been ſhewed, then it is dangerous and pernicious, to retain any relick of the Man of Sin, that falſe, erroneous, idolatrous Church, in Doctrine, Worſhip, or Government, which they have pretended to be according to the Word of God, but have wreſted the Scriptures to their own deſtruction, as 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. It is dangerous to retain ſuch cuſtoms and uſages in the Church, whereby we may Symbolize with *Rome*; How fatal ſeveral things have been to the publick peace of the Church, which have been derived from Antichriſt is too well known, from the diviſions, contentions, and perſecutions which have continued to this day. By theſe very means, the Papacy together with their Religion, have had a party, and

and kept up an intereſt among the Proteſtant Churches, and alſo a favourable reſpect among many, who have had a ſecret affection for the Pope and his Religion. Such will not have it that the Pope is Antichriſt; and they will needs have it that the Church of *Rome* is a true Church: And that ſhe is the Mother-Church, and that we ought to return to our Mother, with ſuch like. What was the cauſe that the Book of Articles of the Church of *Ireland* was called in, but becauſe they declare the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the Church of *Rome* to be no true Church, and that the Lords day was wholly to be ſanctified. So *Montague* in his *Apello ad Cæſarem*, ſaid, The Pope or Biſhop of *Rome*, perſonally is not The Antichriſt, nor yet the Biſhops of *Rome* Succeſſively. Dr. *Heylin* in his anſwer to *Burton*, maintaineth that the Pope is not Antichriſt. *Chriſtopher Dove*, and *Robert Shelford* were of the ſame mind.

9. Hence it follows that the Proteſtant Churches are unjuſtly charged with Schiſm in departing from *Rome*: the Papiſts charge us with Schiſm becauſe we depart from them, and will not hold Communion with them; though there was the moſt juſt cauſe of this departure from them. 1. In regard they are heretical in their Doctrine, and obſtinately perſiſt in it, againſt all convictions to the contrary, for there have been attempts made to have healed *Babylon*, but ſhe would not be healed, *Jer.* 51. 8, 9. therefore forſake her. *Him that is an Heretick reject, &c. Tit.* 3. 10. 2. When a Church becomes idolatrous in her Worſhip, as 2 *Cor.* 11. 16. then it is a duty to depart from them that depart from the Truth: upon *Jeroboam*'s defection and the peoples with him from the true Worſhip of God, there was a departure from them, by ſuch as ſet their hearts to ſeek the Lord God of *Iſrael*. The Church of *Rome* became moſt corrupt and abominable in her Worſhip, elſe ſhe had not been ſet out by the Whore riding the Beaſt, *Rev.* 17. 3. 3. When a Church becomes bloody, and tyrannical, and perſecuting her Members to the death, then there is juſt cauſe of departing from them. Look on the Church of *Rome* ſet forth by the firſt and ſecond Beaſt, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2, --11, *&c.* both which make up one Antichriſt; ſee how cruel and bloody that Church is: So where it is ſet out by the Whore, *Rev.* 17. 5, 6. drunk with the blood of Saints, there is ſignified a juſt cauſe of departure from her. 4. When a Church groweth wholly corrupt and debauched in her Morals, very vicious and ſcandalous in the lives of Governours and Members, then depart, 2 *Tim.* 3. 1, ---5, there 19 abominations, or thereabout, ſpoken of, of which many ſhould be guilty, *from ſuch turn away*; though they had a form of Godlineſs, ſince they did deny the power of it. I'le make no apology that I have put your patience ſo much to it, but this, That the Man of Sin, with whom I have had to do, is the moſt unruly Beaſt that ever was, and hath put the whole World into a diſorder and confuſion. And though I have exerciſed your patience while I have been Preaching on this Beaſt; yet I wiſh and pray that your patience may not be put to it by this Beaſt, as *Rev.* 13. 7. But if it ſhould pleaſe God to let looſe this Beaſt upon you, my prayer is, that it may be ſaid of you, as it was of them, *verſ.* 10. *Behold the Faith and Patience of the Saints.*

SERM.

SERMON V.

The SCRIPTURE to be read by the Common People.

THE Controverſie before us is, Whether the Scriptures are to be read and heard, of, and by the Lay-people? and whether they are to be tranſlated into the Vulgar Tongues? the Papiſts deny, we affirm. My buſineſs will lye in three Propoſitions.

I. That the People are to hear and read the Scriptures.

II. That therefore the Scripture is the Word of God was written for them, and to them.

III. Therefore it is to be tranſlated into Vulgar Tongues.

The firſt is an expreſs Precept; the ſecond is a reaſon to prove the firſt; the third is an Inference from both.

And ſeriouſly when I have been muſing upon this queſtion, I profeſs heartily I have been ſurprized with amazement, how ſuch a Controverſie ſhould ariſe amongſt Chriſtians (if Chriſtians). Might not a man as well diſpute whether a *Carpenter* ſhould have his *Line* and *Rule* to work by? or a *Soldier* wear his *Sword* in the midſt of Enemies? Shall I queſtion whether the *Air* be neceſſary for *Breath*, or *Bread* for *Life*, or the *Light* of the *Sun* for our Secular Affairs? Sure enough the Word of God is all this, a *Rule* moſt perfect, a *Sword* moſt victorious, *Air* moſt fragrant, *Food* moſt wholſome, and *Light* moſt clear; the Word of an Angel preciſely conſidered, is no ground for Faith, nor Rule for life, duty, and worſhip. The Word of God read and heard (ſaith our Church) is ſo great a good, *that the benefits ariſing therebence are inexpreſſible, unconceivable*; the Bible (ſaith that painful, pious, learned Biſhop *Hooper*) *Why*, (ſaith he) *God in Heaven, and the King in Earth hath not a greater friend than the Bible*, in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to King *Edward* the Sixth. But I ſhall ſay no more of theſe, nor of any Proteſtants, becauſe they are parties, and therefore their Teſtimony though moſt true, is not proper. This Word is for the Soul, and is not the Soul more than Life; this light is to give the knowledg of the Glory of God

in the face of Jesus Christ; and is not this infinitely beyond all our natural and civil concerns? all these things here below, either within us or without us are short-lived and vexation, but this makes a Man wise, and that to Salvation, and that through the Knowledg of and Faith in our Lord Jesus. And after all this and much more that might be said concerning this treasury of all Wisdom and Knowledg, shall it be a question whether the People so highly concerned in these things, shall they hear or read the Scripture? this is to me is wonderful; But the question is put beyond all question as to our adversaries, 'tis defined, determined by the *Council* (as they call it) of *Trent* in the negative, that the Lay-people shall not read, or hear the Scriptures read, no, nor have a Bible in the Vulgar Tongue under great Penalties; nay, the Priest reads it not in their publick Worship. The words are these, *Si quis legere aut habere præsumpserit*; If any shall presume to read or have a Bible; what then? why, the penalty is this, *absolutionem peccatorum percipere non posset*; he may not, nay he cannot, be absolved from his sins, they exclude such a man from remission of his sins; it seems the reading of the Bible is a sin unpardonable. The people are taught to believe, That what the Pope binds on Earth is bound in Heaven; sure then (I judg this must be the sence of the Canon, (*viz.*) If a man that reads the Scripture, or hath a Bible in his House comes to confession and is absolved, that Absolution is invalid; he is not *subjectum capax*, he doth *ponere obicem*, there is a bar lies in his way to hinder his Absolution, and that bar is his reading or having the holy Bible. My reason is this, though he had a thousand Bibles, and did confess it to the Priest as his fault, he would absolve him, and the Absolution would stand good; so that to have a Bible and read it, puts a man into the state of Damnation, and no man can read the Scriptures but under the greatest penalty, *sc.* under the pain of Damnation. By this *Trent Conciliabulum*, Conventicle, you see, Wo be to the Bible, and all the friends thereof; *Bened. Furret* in his Preface to the Index, *Lib. Prob. & expurg.* tells us, that *Misericordiæ ergo Dei librum nullus locus est*; There is no place of mercy left to the Book of God: Men fly from the Gospel (saith he) in the *Italian* or *Spanish* Tongue, *Feste citius*, faster than they would run from the plague of Pestilence.

But you will say the Councils prohibition of the Bible is with a limitation, *viz.* If you have a Bible without a license from the Bishop; they do not forbid licensed men the reading, and therefore wrong them not.

I answer, 'tis true they do speak to that purpose, I will not wrong them; but give me leave to do the truth and you right by telling you, that their pretence of a license is a very *flam*, a meer *gullery*, an abominable *cheat*, as I shall shew you in its place.

Further, that this Book may not spread abroad, the High-Priest and Elders in this Council straitly charge and command all Book-sellers and all Dealers in Books, that they sell not or any other way part with any one

one of these Books to any person upon the forfeiture of the price of the said Books, and to undergo all other punishment according to the *arbitrium*, will and pleasure of the Bishop. I confess this is drawn up very cunningly with much craft, as indeed all their Doctrines are expressed with artifice and subtilty. But if you read the Mandate of the Archbishop of *Toledo* by the Authority of *Paul the fifth*, there the punishment is this, *1. For the first time he shall be punished*, suspensione Officii, *suspension from his Office, loss of his trade for two years, banishment twelve miles from the Town*, ubi Bibliopolium habuit, *for two years, and fined* 1200 *Ducats*; *Mille ducentorum Ducatorum mulcta puniendus*; this for the first fault. But for the second time, *si recidat*, then the *punishment to be doubled, and other punishments*, ex Inquisitoris arbitrio eroganda, *according to the will of the Inquisitor*; and all this, *Si quis habere aut emere vel vendere ausit*; if any dare *be so hardy as to have, or buy, or sell a Bible*. And those Traders that are not so skilful as to understand the Catalogue of Books prohibited, must either take a *man of skill into their Shop*, or *shut up their Shop-windows*; for whosoever shall offend in this case, though *per negligentiam, or ignorantiam, a pœna, nulla ratione exemptum iri*, though *they offend through neglect or unskilfulness shall not be exempted from punishment upon any account whatsoever*. And *Paul* the fifth by his *Breve sub annulo Piscatoris* dated at *Rome*, 1612, forbids all persons, *Ne legant aut teneant*, that *they should not read or keep these Books under the punishment of the greater Excommunication and other Censures*; but bring them by a certain day to be prefixed by the holy Inquisitor General, into the holy Office of the Inquisition; and accordingly the said Inquisitor in his *Pontificalibus* specifies in his Mandate this to be done within ninty days, all Books prohibited in the Index to be brought into the Office: Now amongst the Books in the Index, which are prohibited by Pontifical Authority, the *Bible* is the special *Book* forbidden. And to make all sure as much as may be by men and others, there are towards a hundred of *Latin* Versions of the Bible prohibited in this Catalogue; and to be yet more sure that the Bible of all Books may not escape, this Inquisitor General by the Popes Authority doth call in not only Books prohibited in the Index, but *Librum aut libros in Regulis Generalibus comprehensos*, *Book or Books comprehended in the General Rules*. Now the fourth General Rule (observe I pray) is made solely against the Bible in any vulgar Tongue, they are not to be endured; nay against any parts of it, as suppose some of *Davids* Psalms, or some of *Pauls* Epistles; nay, whether they be printed, or written, *sive excusa, sive manuscripta*; nay, all *Summaries* or *brief heads* of the *Bible*; nay, *quantumvis historica*, although it be a Compendium of the Historical parts of it, all is forbidden. And if any man of what calling or dignity soever, be he *Bishop* or *Patriarch*, be he *Marquess* or *Duke*, (where is the Tradesman or Farmer, or Gentleman now?) if any of these shall dare the contrary, they are *rebells to our Mandate*, immorigeri, *disobedient to holy Church*, and

shall be suspect of Heretical pravity; and I promise you that is a fair way to the Inquisition; *i.e.* the loss of liberty, pains of the body, forfeiture of goods, and loss of life *ut plurimum*.

Object. *But whatever you say, the Council doth permit reading the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, provided you have a license.*

Answ. I told you before, this license was a meer *blind*, a fallacy, a *flame*. But because I am in hand with the Author, and to stay your stomachs till I come to handle this in its due place; for present I will only tell you this, (*viz.*) That Pope *Paul* the fifth in his Breve lately quoted doth recal all such Licenses. I will give you the sum of it, it begins thus, *Ad futuram rei memoriam*, *Since as we understand the Licenses of reading the Books of Heresies, or Books suspected of Heresie*, or Books otherwise prohibited and condemned, (there comes in the Bible) *obtained under certain pretenses*, do too much increase in the Kingdoms of *Spain*, (*in Regnis Hispaniarum*); and *understanding, that there is more danger to the unlearned than profit to the learned, by, and from the said Licenses*; we therefore *upon whom the burden of watching over the Lords flock is incumbent, being willing to provide a seasonable remedy, and walking* in the steps of our Predecessors Popes of *Rome* (mark that for anon), *we do annul, casse, revoke, irritamus & viribus penitus evacuamus, utterly make void all such Licenses, Faculties and Grants*; and by the tenour of these presents we *do decise and declare the same to be cassate*, void and null, *easque nemini suffragari posse*; granted *by whomsoever*, whether our *Predecessors, our Selves, our Penitentiary, Ordinaries, or Bishops whomsoever*, and granted to *what persons soever, whether Abbots, Patriarchs, Marquesses, Dukes*, or any other persons *Ecclesiastick*, or *Mundane*, quacunque auctoritate fulgeant, whether they have had their License by *Letters Apostolical*, in form of a Breve under the *Seal*, or any other peculiar way to make the License firm and lasting, we revoke and annul all to the utmost.

Non obstantibus constitutionibus, Ordinationibus Apostolicis, any Constitutions and Ordinations Apostolical to the *contrary in any wise notwithstanding, under the pains and censures of the Church to the highest*; & invocato si opus est brachio Sæculari, (*i.e.* under *the penalty of a Fool*, a Dungeon, a Faggot), and we command *All Archbishops, &c.* to take care that these our Letters be *forthwith published in all Provinces, Cities, Dioceses, absque alia requisitione ejus desuper faciendâ, &c.* without demurring, disputing, demanding why or wherefore. Here is fine work, not a crevise, a think left unstopped. Do you not see what care here is taken to suppress all Licenses, nay though under the Popes Seal? See what a roaring Bull here is, and what is your License now, I pray? a Fig-leaf. In the midst of this Breve his Holiness gives a *Mandamus* to the Inquisitor-General, the Archbishop of *Toledo* to prosecute this Breve to the utmost, not to suffer any person though never so great to have or keep, or read, or buy, or sell a Bible; which accordingly he did execute, as before.

For

For other Books I am not concerned, for baſtardly patches added to the Fathers, which are many, and caſtrations of them, which are groſs; if I could I may not meddle with that affair. I only take notice of the *Index Expurg.* how theſe Fathers of *Rome* blot out, and command to be blotted out the ſayings of the Ancient Fathers as they are placed in the *Indexes* made either by the Interpreters, or the Publiſhers of them: As for inſtance, in *Athanaſius* ſet forth *Græco-latin*; in the *Index* there was ſet down thus, *Scripturæ ſacræ etiam plebi & Magiſtratibus cognoſcendæ, Deleatur.* i.e. The Holy Scriptures are to be known even of the Common-people, and the Magiſtrates; blot that out ſay they: Again, *Scriptura ſacra ita clara eſt ut quiſque, &c.* The *Holy Scripture is ſo plain that any one may underſtand*; blot that out. Five more ſayings there are about the *ſufficiency* of the Scriptures, and that they only are to be heard; *Deleantur*, blot them all out; theſe Sentences will puzzle young Students, confirm the Hereticks: But indeed the true reaſon is they will diſcover our wickedneſs and hereſies. So they deal with St. *Auſtins* works *Baſileæ ex Officina Froben. Purgatorium non inveniri in Scriptura*; Purgatory not to be found in the Scripture; *Deleatur*, let it be *expunged* ſay they; and good reaſon, for ſuch paſſages will make your Kitchin cold. And ſpecial order is given by theſe Fathers that care be taken *to blot out all ſuch paſſages, Ex quocunque alio indice*: ſpecially *4th. Edit. there named*, & ex aliis ſimilibus; and *Lib.* 2. *de Bapt. cont. Donat.* there is this ſhort paſſage, *Non eſt in Evangelio*; there is no ſuch thing in the Goſpel, Dele, *blot it out.* So they ſerve *Chryſoſtom*, *Baſileæ ex Offic. Frob.* 1558, *Sine Scriptura nihil aſſerendum; Scripturæ Divinæ omnibus volentibus pervia & faciles; Scripturarum lectio omnibus: Scripturas continere omnia, Scripturas legere, omnibus etiam*; with ſome others, as *Apoſtolorum Doctrina facilis & omnibus pervia*: i.e. *The Scriptures are plain to the willing, they are to be read of all, even* Artificers, the *Scriptures contain all things neceſſary*, and the like; away with theſe *ſays* Holy Mother Church, blot them out every one, and good reaſon, for open that door once, then farewell all. Hitherto we have had two Acts of the Pope and his Council, one to call in the Bibles condemned that were abroad; the other to prevent their going abroad for the future, but all too late: Alas this would not do, therefore they take two other courſes; the firſt was this, The holy Synod decreeth that no man dare (*audeat*) to *interpret or expound Scripture in another ſenſe, ſave that*, quam ſancta mater Eccleſia tenuit, which *holy Mother-Church hath holden, and doth hold*; *whoſe right it is* (cujus eſt) *to whom it belongs to judg of the interpretation of the holy Scripture*: although ſuch interpretations were never uttered before, they that ſhall oppoſe this let them be *declared by the Ordinaries*, and *puniſhed* according to the Statutes. So that if the Pope (for he is the Church, as you muſt know) ſhall affirm, *Joh.* 21. 16. *Paſce oves*, Peter *feed my Sheep*; if he ſhall ſay that the meaning of that Text is this, that by theſe words our Lord Chriſt gave to *Peter* an Univerſal Headſhip over the Church, and in *ordine ad*

ſpiritu-

Spiritualia, a Soveraignty absolute over all Kings to plant and pluck up, and that all this Power is given to the Pope as *Peters* Succeſſor; why then you are to believe it, you muſt not take any other ſenſe, though this be non-ſenſe and never heard of before, that is all one.

So the ſecond *Council of Nice*, quoted and approved by the Council of *Trent*, countenanced by the Legats and Lies of *Adrian* the firſt, proves Images to be worſhipped, thus, *No man lights a candles and puts it under a buſhel*, therefore the *holy Images are to be placed* upon the Altars; *O res inconſequens & riſu digna*, ſaid *Carolus Magnus*. But what is that, let it be never ſo ridiculous and worthy to be hiſſed at; you may not dare to take any other ſenſe, you may not quarrel at the Inference, though it be monſtrouſly irrational; if you do, they have two Swords, and with one they will cut you off from the *Church*, and with the other, *ſc.* the Secular, they will cut you off from the *Earth*; for the Church ſaith, That is the meaning of *Ecce duo gladii*, Behold *here are two Swords*; the one ſhall *unchriſtian* you, and the other ſhall *unman* you.

The ſecond courſe the Council hath taken to help themſelves, is this; They have added to the Holy Bible (deſpairing of any relief there) the *Apocrypha*, and make *Tobias* and *Judith*, and the two *Maccabees*, with the reſt of the Stories of *Bel* and the *Dragon*, a Rule for Faith and Life, and whoſoever ſhall not take them for the Word of God, Sacred and Canonical, they curſe him, let him be *Anathema*; they ſend a man to Hell, if he refuſe *Toby*. They have alſo ſtitched or patched to the Holy Bible their Traditions under the name of *Apoſtolical*, containing *matters appertaining to Faith and Life*; and theſe Traditions (which are in *ſcrinio pectoris Papæ*), under lock and key in the Popes breaſt, they command under the pain of *Anathema* to be received *pari Pietatis affectu & reverentia*, with an equal pious affection and reverence as we receive the Word of God. Oh horrible!

The firſt of theſe courſes, *viz.* to oblige men to underſtand Scriptures as the Church; *i.e.* the Pope expounds them, this is a reproach to the reaſon of Mankind; *Bubalum eum eſſe non hominem*, it degrades men into brutes. The ſecond goes higher, and is a reproach to the Soveraignty, Goodneſs, Wiſdom, Faithfulneſs of our Lord Jeſus. They do by this means horribly reproach the Apoſtles; for if the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament under one kind, and Invocation of Saints, Merit of works, Worſhip in an unknown Tongue, with others; if theſe be *Traditions* as their learned men ſay, and if their Traditions be Apoſtolical from the mouth of Chriſt, and dictates of the bleſſed Spirit as the Council ſaith; Oh then what an ugly and black reproach is here caſt upon the Apoſtles: nay, it is a moſt prodigious blaſphemy againſt the Lord Chriſt, and his holy Spirit, that the Apoſtles ſhould teach, and practiſe, and write one thing to the Churches, and after whiſper the clean contrary to ſome others who ſhould convey it by word of mouth to poſterity.

Any

Any man sees that these four points of Faith which they would prove by Tradition are directly contrary to what the Apostles preached and practised, and wrote to the Churches. But this is not my business, I only touch upon this.

But perhaps you will demand upon what reason the Council did thus decree? I *Answer*, they tell you, *sc. cum experimento manifestum sit*, 'tis manifest *by experience that the sufferance of the Bible in the vulgar tongue* doth *more harm than good through mens rashness*, *Ergo we forbid it*: A doughty reason, no question of it! as if some Souldiers rashly abusing their weapons, therefore the General should command, and that upon grievous penalties, and that when they are faced by their deadly enemies, all the Army to be disarmed. Should a Protestant decree against Prayer, because Prayers of Papists are blasphemous? or against the use of the Lords Supper, because the Mass is Impious and Idolatrous? What decrees were these? Must Gods appointment be anulled, because of mens abuse? Why did they not decree that men should be prohibited the use of the light of the Sun by day, and Moon by night, because thieves and others abuse it? Doubtless such Decrees had not been so irrational and mischievous as this, for that light is for my body, for the face and converse with man, for my Secular affairs, and but for a time: but the light of the Scriptures (which they forbid with a curse) is for my Soul, for the face of Jesus, for Spiritual concerns, and for Eternity. The truth of the case is this, the experience of the Council was of that kind which *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen* feared would be theirs, if *Paul* be suffered, down goes *Diana*, and our Market is spoiled. I will tell you as briefly and as fully as I can the story of this experience.

About the year 1516, the Friars are sent by *Leo 10th.* abroad with their Pardons to raise money for his Holiness, Indulgences for horrid Sins are sold at easie rates. Into *Germany* come the *Friars*, *Luther* (who had some years before quitted the study of the Law, and applied himself to the close and daily study of the Scriptures, and had been blessed with some taste of the Righteousness of Jesus Christ, unexpectedly began to stir against these Pardon-mongers; yet at first very mildly, not simply against the thing, but against the impudence and covetousness of the Friars: the Friars feornfully and publickly traduce *Luther*, he takes heart, and begins to dispute, write and preach against them; this spark thus blown suddenly becomes a great flame. The Pope begins to storm, and writes about this affair to Cardinal *Cajetan*; *Cajetan* disputes *Luther*, and quotes against him the Bull of *Clement* the sixth, which runs thus, *Wherein*, una guttula, *one drop of the Blood of Christ had been sufficient for Redemption, and streams of Blood came from his Body, all that Blood which was over and above*, Christ *had deposited as a precious treasure in the hand of* Peter, *Claviger* (the Key-keeper of Heaven) and to his Successors, *to be dispensed*, (*i.e.* to be sold) to Penitents, and so likewise the surplusage of the Merits of the Virgin *Mary*, and all the Saints, *Tanquam*,

ista-

inexhausta condonandi materia, an *inexhaustible store-house of Pardons*. *Luther* retels the Bull by Scripture; *Frederick* of *Saxony* shews him favour, the University of *Wittemberg* defends him; *Frederick* the Duke of *Saxony* sends him *Cajetans* Letter; *Luther* intreats the Controversie may be decided in *Germany*; the Emperour summoned him upon safe conduct to appear at *Worms*; accordingly he appears, there in the Imperial Assembly, and after in the Lodgings of an Archbishop before some other Princes; he humbly but vehemently offers himself to be *tried by the Scriptures, or evident Reason*; he is banished *Germany*, and appeals to a General Council; the Pope fears a Council as the shadow of death. All this and much more was done in five years, it was day-light all abroad in several places by this time; the Gospel had dispelled the darkness of Popery without any great noise or bustle. The Council of *Trent* convened not till the year 1546, about thirty years after the Preaching of the Gospel began, and was carried on by men of renown, for learning, piety and pains; the Council prohibits the Bible *ob temeritatem*, for *the rashness of men*, but doth not tell us what men, nor in what. Our excellent and learned Translators in their *Epist. Dedicat.* to King *James* say, that they *expect to be maligned for their work by the Papists, because they desire to keep the people in ignorance and darkness*. Dr. *White* in his defence, *cap.* 51. saith, That *from mens rashness they dishonestly, nay most dishonestly, conclude the utter suppressing of the Scriptures, not that they care how they are used*, (for never any men used them so vilely as themselves, either in applying, reviling, or corrupting of them), but because *they are mad at the Bible which discovers their heresie*.

And if ever they get power again, 'tis probable (they may learn more wit by their experience, and *Rome*-Papal may serve the Book of God, as *Rome*-Pagan served the Oracles of the *Sybils* heretofore; namely, take it out of their Popish World, and chain it fast in the *Vatican*, there to be inspected only by a few Confidents, and to be expounded as the Pope pleaseth. *Origen* said of old that the *reading of the Scriptures was the torment of the Devil*; sure it torments some body else of later years, but in *Origens* time it was not so; the Bible burns the Devil, and the Pope burns the Bible.

Thus we have seen the Council biting sore, but not opening much; that is left to their Doctors, whose clamours have been loud and importunate, and their tongues set on fire from beneath against this holy Word from that day to this. They that do evil hate the light, the thief curseth the Candle, the Malefactor would dispatch his Judg; the design of these Doctors is to make the most sound and fully perfect Scripture to be as the people at the Pool of *Bethesda*, halt, blind, lame, withered. *Alb. Pigh.* a prime man (I promise you) gives this advice, They should (*declamitare*) *often declaim against the Scripture*, and that *Rhetoricis artificiis*, with *Rhetorical artifices* and *flourishes* complain of their *difficulty, darkness, shortness, lameness, imperfections, blemishes*; on t'other side

ſide they ſhould ſtrenuouſly contend for *the neceſſity, authority, certainty, perfection, clearneſs, of Traditions unwritten*; and then, *nullo negotio*, no doubt *they ſhall eaſily carry the day*. And what *Pighius* adviſed his fellows to do, he practiſed himſelf ſufficiently. *Andradius* a great ſtickler in the Council, and a daring-man, takes the ſame courſe, and good reaſon; for he confeſſeth, That *many and weighty points too of their Religion would reel and ſtagger, if they were not ſupported by Traditions.* Orthod. Explic. *lib.* 2.

Canus a conſiderable man Biſhop of the *Canaries* tells his fellows, That there is *more force and ſtrength to confute Hereticks in Traditions, than in the Scripture.* And after that he had wreſted the Fathers, compared his adverſaries to the Devil, quoting Scripture, alledged *Plato* and *Farguin* to juſtifie their practice, ſpit his venom into the face of the Bible, and urged a non-ſenſical argument, *viz.* Dabo legem, *I will put my Law in their hearts*; Ergo, there *are Traditions.* I ſay after this ſtuff he tells us the reaſon of it, *Quorſum hæc?* (ſaith he) *nempe omnem ferme diſputationem, &c.* that *well-nigh all diſputation with Hereticks is to be decided rather by Tradition than Scripture:* Lib. 3. Com. loc. c. 3. That is, in plain *Engliſh*, we muſt reſolve our Faith and Practice in the things of God into the Popes breaſt, rather than into the word of Jeſus Chriſt.

So likewiſe *Briſtow* teaching his Scholar how to grapple with the Proteſtants, teacheth him thus; That he muſt *firſt get the proud Hereticks out of the weak and falſe caſtle of only Scripture*, (do you not obſerve his reverence? he calls the Scripture weak and falſe, *O ſi durum & impium!*) *and bring him into the plain field of Traditions*, and then the *cowards will run*; *i.e.* ſet the Pope in the Throne, and Chriſt at his Foot-ſtool, and then no doubt of the victory. For you muſt know the Pope hath the plenitude of all Power, to mint and ſtamp Traditions, to allow Miracles, and to expound Councils and Fathers as he pleaſeth, and then all is our own. *Briſtow ult. Mot.*

I am weary of this, it were endleſs to repeat their Blaſphemies in advancing the Papacy, and abuſing Scripture. I will name but one Doctor more, when I have told you a Story out of a good Author. About the year 1523, ſeven years after *Luther* began to preach, they were ſo mad againſt the Scriptures, and ſo vexed at the light, *that they burned two* Auſtin *Friars at* Bruſſels, *only for this, that they preferred the Scriptures above the Popes Decrees.* There appears nothing elſe in the Hiſtory, *Cum in eo perſiſterent, damnati ſunt capitis & exuſti*; Sleidan. Commen. lib. 4. Send men out of the World in fiery flames, becauſe they will prefer Chriſt the Lord above the Pope! this is ſomewhat hard.

The Doctor (I mean) is *Coſter* the Jeſuit, he in his *Enchir. cap.* 1. divides Gods Word into three Parts: The firſt Part is that *which he wrote himſelf in the two Tables.* The ſecond Part *that which he commanded to be wrote by others; the Old and New Teſtament.* The third Part, *that which he neither wrote himſelf, nor rehearſed to others, but left it to them to do*

themſelves, as Traditions, the *Popes Decrees*, and *the Decrees of Councils*. And he makes this Application of his Diſtinction, that many *things of Faith are wanting in the two former*, (very good, it ſeems God by himſelf, and by his Prophets and Apoſtles gives out his mind defectively); *neither would Chriſt have his Church depend upon them*; (Oh horrible daringneſs)! The latter (ſaith he) *viz.* the *Traditions and Popes Decrees are the beſt Scripture*, the *Judg of Controverſies, the Expoſitor of the Bible, and that whereupon we muſt wholly depend.* That is, blot out the Sun, and ſet up a ſtinking Farthing-candle, this is the deſign. However you may obſerve in a few words a great deal of blaſphemy, and ſome honeſty: the Blaſphemy lies in theſe particulars. 1. That God hath revealed his Will ſhort and ſcanting; a horrid reproach to the glory of his Wiſdom and Mercy! 2. That the Lord Chriſt would not have us truſt to his Word; a moſt vile reproach to his Care and Faithfulneſs over his own Houſe! 3. That muſty, duſty Traditions, and the Popes Decrees are the Word of God. 4. That the Decrees of men, of whom ſome have been *Negromancers, Converſers with the Devil, Poyſoners, Murtherers, Adulterers*, nay *Traytors, Blood-ſuppers, Ignorant*, are the Rule of Faith: The Honeſty is in this, that he joyns hand in hand, together Traditions and Popes Decrees, and well they may, for they are brethren, and have one and the ſame Parent. 2. In that he confeſſeth that Traditions were not rehearſed or delivered from God by word of mouth; and therefore the Council of *Trent* put a ſad and miſerable blind and cheat upon Princes and People, while they ſay that Traditions were either ſpoken by Chriſt, or dictated by the Holy Ghoſt.

Leſt any man ſhould ſay that theſe Doctors were private men, which is their common and laſt ſhift, I will ſhut up all with their *new Creed*. Know then, that *Paul* the 4*th*. ſet forth a Creed of his own, conſiſting of Twelve Articles, added to the Twelve of the Creed, called the Apoſtles; out of which I ſhall take only three, proper to my buſineſs. The title of it is, *The publick profeſſion of the Orthodox faith to be uniformly obſerved and profeſſed.* The firſt Article is, The *Apoſtolick and Eccleſiaſtical Traditions, and other Obſervances and Conſtitutions of* that Church do *I firmly admit and embrace.*

2. Art. *Alſo the Sacred Scriptures do I admit according to that ſenſe which our Mother the Church hath holden, and doth hold*, whoſe right it is to judg of *the true ſence and interpretation of the Scriptures.*

3. Art. *I do vow and ſwear true obedience to the Biſhop of* Rome, *and all other things likewiſe do I undoubtingly receive and confeſs, which are delivered, defined and declared by the ſacred Canons and General Councils*, eſpecially the *holy Council of Trent*; and withal I *condemn, reject and accurſe all things that are contrary hereunto*; and *all Hereſies whatſoever condemned, rejected, and accurſed by the Church.* And this true Catholick Faith *I will maintain inviolate to the laſt gaſp; and I will take care of thoſe which ſhall be under me, or ſuch as I ſhall have charge over in my calling, to be holden,*

taught

taught or preached to the uttermost of my power; this I promise, vow and swear; So God be help me, and his holy Gospel.

Thus the Bow is bent, and the Arrow upon the string, to shoot through the heart of the Scripture, the foundations of the Prophets and Apostles must be cast down, or else Babel will fall; there is the *origine* of these and such like out-ragious reproaches upon the Oracles of the blessed God: Pass over to the Isles of *Chittim*, go to *Kedar*, Did ever any Nation do this to their Oracles? Did the Pagans ever do such indignities to the dictates of their *Druides?* or their *Brachmans?* or the *Turks* to their *Alchoran?*

This Controversie then, whether the People of God should read and hear the Word of God, (which would make a man wonder that ever such a question should be moved, the duty being so solemnly enjoyned, the practice of it so necessary, the fruit of it so profitable, which made *David* wiser than his *Enemies*, than his *Teachers*, than the *Aged*, better to him than *all treasures*, *sweeter* than the *honey-comb.*) I say this Controversie shall through Gods assistance discuss and deliver you my thoughts upon it from the 1 *Thess.* 5. 27. that is my Text.

---

1 Thes. 5. 27. *I charge you by the Lord that this Epistle be read to all the holy Brethren.*

THis Text is a Constitution *Scriptural*, one of the true Canons of the Apostles, directly opposite to the Constitutions of the Pope, and the Canons of the Council of *Trent*, as we shall see by and by. It may be resolved into these parts;

1. An Injunction to a Duty, that is Reading, *that it be read.*

2. The subject or matter to be read, that is, *this Epistle.* And by the same reason all the rest, for the wit of all the Jesuits in the World cannot frame an Objection against the Reading of any, which may not be as well made against the reading of this one.

3. The Object or Parties to whom, the *holy Brethren*, i.e. the People.

4. The Extent, *to all*, all the holy Brethren.

5. The Solemnity of this Injunction, *I charge you*, not I beseech, or intreat, or I exhort, (as sometimes he doth), but *I charge*; and that not simply a bare charge, but the highest that can be, and the only time that ever *Paul* did give this which is so high, that none can be higher. He doth indeed charge *Timothy* solemnly, 1 *Tim.* 6. 13. but there it is, before ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, *in the presence of God*; but in my Text it is τὸν κύριον, *i.e.* τῷ τὸν κύριον, *by the Lord*; there it is παραγγέλλω, *præcipio*, *I charge*, *I command*; but here it is, ὁρκίζω, *I charge*, *I adjure*; ὁρκίζω, is *juramento obstringo*; it hath the force of an Oath, and that under the

curſe, *I adjure thee*, (ſaith the High Prieſt) to our Lord Chriſt, *Mat.* 26. 63. Ἐξορκίζω σε, *I adjure thee by the living God tell us*; implying an Execration in caſe of ſpeaking falſly. The Apoſtle *Paul* doth not deal with them in this place, *obſecrando*, as the *Latins* uſed to do, *per Deos Deaſque omnes*, as ſome think; (yet even in that ſenſe the words had been very vehement, and in caſe of failure of not reading would import vengeance on them for it), but here he deals *execrando*, his charge hath the form of an Oath, obliging under pain of the curſe, and ſo Dr. *Hammond* renders it: הִשְׁבִּיעַ *in Hiphil*, is literally and critically to *make ſwear*, to *adjure*; and is expreſſed by *Pauls*, ἐνορκίζω, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 27. I bind you under the curſe of God that this Epiſtle be read. The Law concerning this we have *Numb.* 5. 21. where we have not ſimply an Execration, but there we have the Oath of Execration: Thus he upon *Mat.* 26. *note* 1.

The Text thus explained (methinks) among ſober men ſhould quickly decide the Controverſie; For whether we ſhould obey the Lord Chriſt, or the Council of *Trent*? Whether we ſhould believe *Paul* the Apoſtle ſpeaking by the Holy Ghoſt, or *Paul* the Pope ſpeaking by a pack of Paraſites, judg ye: Which curſe of the two ſhould we dread, this of God in the Text, or that of Man at *Trent*? Surely there is no difficulty to determine this point.

The words thus opened will to our buſineſs afford us three Obſervables; 1. The ſtate of the *ſeries* of Popes or Antichriſt. 2. His Character. 3. His Confutation.

1. *His ſtate is a ſtate accurſed*; I offer my proof thus. They that do not read the Scriptures to the People in the vulgar Tongue, according to the duty of their Office, nor ſuffer the people to read themſelves; nay, that do prohibit them to have a Bible, and that by a ſevere Law under a grievous penalty; theſe for ſo doing are bound under the curſe of God; But Antichriſt doth all this: Therefore the ſtate of Antichriſt is a curſed ſtate. The Propoſition or Major is the Text, the Truth of God; the Aſſumption is notorious, the Practice of *Rome* or Antichriſt: The Concluſion is regular and natural.

Add to this the wo our Lord Jeſus denounceth againſt the Scribes and Phariſees, *Mat.* 23. 13. becauſe they did *ſhut up the Kingdom of Heaven, took away the key of knowledg.* Luk. 11. 52. *They neither went in themſelves, nor ſuffered thoſe that were entring to go in*; yet theſe never ſuppreſſed the Bible in their own Tongue, much leſs prohibited the reading of it by the People; neither did the Scribes omit the reading of it to the People. The Argument holds from the leſs to the greater; in both theſe the Scribes were Saints in compariſon to the Popiſh Doctors, and the non-expounding by far a leſs ſin than the prohibition, and that by a Law under grievous penalty, nay death it ſelf, as it will appear anon.

2. Here we have the marks of Antichriſt, *Dan.* 7. 24. (for it cannot with

with truth and ſenſe be underſtood of any other), ſaith of him, *He ſhall think to change times and laws, ſc.* of the *moſt High*. *Paul* giveth this mark of him, He ſhall not only exalt himſelf above all Auguſtneſs, (Σέβασμα λεγόμενον, *Augustus* ſc. *Cæſar*, Act. 25. 21.) not only above the Emperour and Princes, but 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4. *ſhews himſelf as God*, ſc. *in changing Laws Divine*, and making new Laws, new Creeds to bind the Conſcience; this mark is viſible in many particulars. But to my buſineſs, thus; The Lord Chriſt *commands* the people to ſearch the *Scripture*; the Pope *commands* no, no ſuch matter. *Chriſt* commands them to ſearch *Moſes* and the Prophets, the *Old* Teſtament; the *Pope* forbids them to ſearch either *Old*, or *New*. Chriſt ſaith, *In them you think to have eternal life*; the Pope ſaith the contrary, There is more *danger* of eternal death. Chriſt gives this reaſon, *they teſtifie of me*; the Pope ſaith, No, they are very *dark* and *obſcure*, very ſhort and *defective*, therefore no competent witneſs. Chriſt ſaith, *Let my word dwell in you richly*; the Pope ſaith, No, not dwell, no not in your Houſes. Chriſt ſaith, *teaching and admoniſhing one another*; the Pope ſaith, *Brabling* and *perverting* one another. Chriſt ſaith, *Whatever you do in word or deed, do it according to my word*; the Pope ſaith, Do my word, obſerve *our Decrees, or elſe I will burn you*. Chriſt commands in my Text that this Epiſtle *be read*; the Pope commands the contrary, No *reading*. Chriſt ſaith, *To all the Brethren*; the Pope ſaith, No, not to any *Lord*, or *Duke*, or *Prince*; (*Franciſcus Encænas* as learned a man as *Spain* afforded, was impriſoned fifteen Months, expecting death every day, but marvelouſly delivered; only for preſenting the New Teſtament in *Spaniſh* to the Emperour *Charles* the Fifth). Chriſt ſaith, *I charge* you to read; the Pope ſaith, I *charge you*, you do not read. Chriſt ſaith, I *charge you under my curſe*; the Pope ſaith, I *charge you not to do it*, under the *curſe* of the *Church*. Chriſt ſaith, I charge you under the *pain of Hell-fire*; the Pope ſaith, I charge you do not under the pain of Hell, and the Stake in *Smithfield* too.

Thus you ſee his mark, and 'tis the ſame in many other Particulars; as for inſtance, Chriſt *commands* in the Supper, *Drink ye all of this*; the Pope prohibits it, *Not a man of you ſhall drink a drop*; but that is excentrical, now it is the buſineſs of another.

3. Here we have the *Confutation* of the Popiſh Doctrine and Practice; and this ariſeth out of the Premiſes thus: If the Lord Chriſt frequently commands the reading of the Scriptures by the People, and ſolemnly charged the reading of them to the People, then Popiſh Doctrine and Practice is falſe, and wicked: But Chriſt doth do ſo; Therefore their Doctrine is falſe, and their Practice wicked. On the other ſide; If the Premiſes be true that Chriſt hath commanded and charged this, then the Doctrine and Practice of the Proteſtants is holy, juſt and good; But Chriſt hath ſo done: Therefore their Practice is good. Obſerve from hence, That Popery is not only an *addition* to the Doctrine of Chriſt (as ſome

ſome pretend) but an *Oppoſition*, a flat *Oppoſition* to it; and where it is an *addition*, as in the great buſineſs of Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone, there the *addition* is a *deſtruction*; 'tis ſuch an addition as *Agrippina* made to the Meat of *Claudius Ceſar*, ſuch an addition as deſtroys Religion, and poyſons the Soul. So the Invocating of God, *Meritis & Intercеſſione*, by the Merits and Interceſſion of Saints, and the formal Invocation of Saints and Angels, requeſting their *opem & auxilium*, (very large words, and the very words of the Council), entreating *their help and aſſiſtance*; is not a bare addition, but horrid Blaſphemy and palpable Idolatry: For which things ſake our famous *Engliſh* Divines have held the Church of *Rome* to be no more a true Church, than a *Murderеſs* and a *Whore* can be a *true Subject*, and a *true Wife*; a Metaphyſical verity is an idle whimſey in Moral concerns. And they have held alſo, That a man living and dying a full Papiſt could not be ſaved; every one, ſaith he, may be ſaved from Popery, that is not the buſineſs, but whether he may be ſaved in it? they ſay, No.

In oppoſition to the Popiſh Doctrine this day, I have three things (as I have told you) to aſſert. 1. That the Scriptures are to be read by, and to the People of Chriſt. 2. That therefore the Scripture is Scripture, the Word of God was therefore written. 3. That it is to be tranſlated into the Mother-tongue. The firſt is a plain Duty and conſtant Practice. The 2*d*. is a Reaſon to prove it. The laſt is a manifeſt Inference from them both; For if the Word of God were therefore written that it might be read to and by the People, then it follows of courſe, that it is lawful, honourable, neceſſary to be tranſlated; for if the Shell be not broken, how can we come to the Kernel? if the Trumpet give an uncertain ſound who ſhall prepare himſelf to the Battel? if the Stone be not removed from the Wells mouth, how ſhall the Maidens draw Water?

1. Of the firſt, *Col.* 4. 16. When this *Epiſtle is read amongſt you, cauſe it to be read in the Church of the* Laodiceans; and that *ye read alſo the Epiſtle of* Laodicea, *Epheſ.* 3. 4. Whereby *when you read* ye *may underſtand my knowledg in the Myſtery of Chriſt*. This Epiſtle (it is very probable) was written to all the Churches of *Aſia*, as that to *Corinth* was to all the Churches of *Achaia*, and it is likely the Epiſtle to the *Laodiceans* (being one of theſe Churches) was the ſame with this to *Epheſus*: If any would ſee more of it, he may conſult Dr. *Ushers* Annals, *ad annum Chriſti* 64. or Dr. *Hammond* upon *Col.* 4. *n. a.* All that we get by it, is no more than what we had reaſon to believe before for the ſubſtance: *ſc.* That this Epiſtle was communicated to all the Churches of *Aſia*; only it ſeems very probable that this Epiſtle was inſcribed to the ſeveral Churches by name, one by one. Now theſe two Texts throw *Dagon* upon the threſhold: For obſerve 1. the Apoſtle takes it for granted, that they would read it; nay, he commands them to take care that others may read, and that they read his Epiſtle written to others. 2. He takes

takes them for men of understanding, he doth not look on them as *brutes*. 3. Not only understanding more obvious Truths, but even the Mystery of Christ; he doth not tell them, these are *hard*, *obscure*, they are not for the vulgar, the *rabble*, the *lay people*, in whom there is not *mens*, *consilium*, or *ratio*, but a meer *Bellua multorum capitum*, a *many-headed*, and a *mad-headed Beast*. 4. He doth yield or submit his own understanding of that Mystery to the discerning of these *Ephesians*. The third Text shall be that of *James* in the Council at *Jerusalem*, Act. 15. 21. *For Moses of old hath them that preach him, being read in the Synagogue every Sabbath-day:* This was the old practise from ancient times, *and still is*, saith *James*. Again *Act.* 13. 15. *After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, the Ruler sent to Paul*; it being the custom of the *Jewish* Doctors after reading to expound some Scripture for the instruction of the People; so the Ruler sent to *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and *Paul* preached, one would think this might suffice.

The Testimony of such a Council, the universal, ancient practise of the *Jews* in their Worship, practised by our Lord Jesus, *Luk.* 4. 16. He went into the Synagogue *as his custome was on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read.* Again, the Lord Jesus often in his answers to their questions appeals to their own reading; very often this is his practise; for instance, in the case of Divorce, *Mat.* 19. 3, 4. *Have ye not read that he which made them in the beginning, made them male and female?* And again, for this cause *a man shall forsake father and mother, and they twain shall be one flesh.* So when the Children cried, *Hosanna*, *Have ye not read*, saith he, *out of the mouths of babes, &c.* Mat. 21. 16. and *v.* 42. *Did ye never read in the Scriptures, the stone which the builders refused?* and have ye not read in the Scripture so much as this, *What David did when he was hungry*, Luk. 6. 3. how *he eat the shew-bread, and they that were with him?* And *have ye not read in the Law how the Priest prophane the Temple, and are blameless?* Mat. 12. 5. Very frequently he quotes the Scripture, but mentions not the Prophet nor the Section, they were so well acquainted by reading, and hearing it read, they knew very well the Text. The Sadducees put a case out of the Scripture, *Moses saith if a man die, &c.* he tells them, *They err, not knowing the Scripture*; answers their argument out of the Scripture, appeals to their own reading, *Have ye not read* (saith he) *that which was spoken unto you by God, I am the God of Abraham*, &c. *Mat.* 22. 31, 32. Pray observe God spake that to *Moses* sixteen hundred years before they were born; and Christ saith, God spoke it to them, then it did concern them to know it; then they ought to use the means, then they ought to read, *Have ye not read what God spake to you?* So when he speaks of the abomination standing in the holy place spoken of by *Daniel* the Prophet; he doth not beat them off and tell them it is dark and difficult, no, but directly the contrary, *Let him that readeth, understand*, saith he, *Mat.* 24. 15. And so in the *Revelation* (and sure *Daniels* Propheey, and *Johns* Revelation are the difficultest

teſt pieces in the holy Bible), he is ſo far from affrighting his People from reading of it as a thing unfit or dangerous, that he begins the Revelation with a Bleſſing to the Reader, *Bleſſed is he that readeth*, Rev. 1. 3. Yea, but every one cannot read; why then, *Bleſſed are they that hear*; but why read and hear? why; *that they may underſtand and keep the ſayings of this Book*: the ſealed Book with ſeven Seals is opened, and in the little Book the time determined is expreſſed by days, months, and years, and in every of theſe things there is an agreement to a tittle, we know not indeed where to commence; and I think it is *felix neſcientia*, a profitable neſcience; but ſure the Book is profitable.

I wonder with what face the *Jeſuits* of *Rhemes* in their Preface on their Annotations, could ſcurrilouſly ſcoff at the Hereticks for reading the Revelation; did they ſet themſelves on purpoſe againſt the Teſtimony of Jeſus Chriſt? *They* (the Proteſtants) *read, and to ſee out of pride of heart, and we know what ſpirit they vaunt*; the *Cantica canticorum*, the *Romans* and the *Apocalyps*. Oh ye Jeſuits what makes you to rage and revile, what harm theſe Books do to you! I gueſs this is the reaſon, the *Canticles* in a Heavenly way treats of the near Union of the Church to Jeſus Chriſt, and her daily Communion with him by Faith, Love, Bleſſing, Prayer, Meditation and Obedience to him. Doth this offend you? But why I wonder do you mention the *Romans*, as if it were ſo great a fault for the People of God to read the *Romans*; avaunt impudence joyned with ſpight and malice! had you no more diſcretion but to tell the World in print, That, that Epiſtle did torment you? The truth is, that Epiſtle heweth Popery all to pieces; their mincing Original ſin, their curſed diſtinction of ſins into *Venial* and *Mortal*, (which one diſtinction ruins more Souls than any one in the World, and brings them in more gain than any other), their Juſtification by Works, their Doctrine of Apoſtacy, Election conditional, with the reſt are all confuted and confounded by that Epiſtle.

Beſides in *Pauls* numerous Salutations of the Saints at *Rome* in the 16. *chap.* he never mentions *Peter*, nor any-where elſe in the Epiſtle, never mentions his care over them, or pains amongſt them, nor their reſpect or duty to him; a ſhrewd ſuſpicion, and it is no way fit the People ſhould know ſo much.

For the *Revelation* every one knows the reaſon why they cannot abide that Book to be known and read; for there is deſcribed the great Whore, intoxicating Princes, and the Inhabitants of the Earth with the Wine of her Fornications; the City is ſo plainly deſcribed to be *Rome*, that every Reader preſently underſtands it of the Papacy. And well they may, for the attempts of learned men to apply the *Revelation* to *Rome*-Pagan are lighter than vanity; and the attempts of the Jeſuits to accommodate it to an *Antichriſt* at *Rome*, three years and a half before the end of the World, is moſt *fabulous* and ridiculous; and yet a horrible cheat in *France*, *Spain*, and *Italy*, and other places, where the

the Papists dwell, that Chymerical Antichrist goes for currant.

But to proceed, there are Scriptures yet behind, and they are principal ones, none beyond them; perhaps you think what needs you prove it any more, it is as clear as the Sun? I answer, I have told you my thoughts have been the same; I have wondred how our Divines could be so copious, so laborious, so exact in a point so plain, till I considered that it is one of the main points of greatest moment; let this be for a wonder to us, that the Popes, the Councils, Cardinals, Doctors, men of parts, convenienced with all helps of Libraries, Arts, Languages, should either be so blind, or blinded as not to see it, or else so daring as to deny it, or else so desperate, (this is the case) as tooth and nail, by all means, flattery, fallacy, force, wrestings, perverting Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, to oppose it, to disparage, to blaspheme it, and all to rob the People of God of it, and to make merchandise of their Souls; for that is the meaning of that Text, *Rev.* 18. 13.

The first is that of Christ, *Joh.* 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures*; the Context tells you that Jesus had healed the Cripple that lay at the Pool, the *Jews* cavil at him for carrying his bed, *v.* 10. he defends himself by the Command of him that cured him, *v.* 11. he comes and tells them, *sc.* the *Jews*, that it was Jesus which made him whole, *v.* 15. Upon this the *Jews* sought to kill Jesus, *v.* 16. Upon this Jesus began to preach to them, *v.* 18. to the last *v.* and in this 39. *v.* he commands and exhorts them to search the Scriptures, as if he had said, you will not believe me, though you see my works, and I would not have you believe the Scribes to whom you give too much credence, between us both believe your own eyes, search the Scriptures. *Moses* and the Prophets wrote of me. There is the first.

The second is that of the *Bereans*, That *they searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so*; and they are highly commended for it by the blessed Spirit, *they were more noble*; (Ah the poor *Rhemists*), yet they had their best wits, and did their best endeavours, and many a year they were a contriving their Annotations), how are they confounded and puzzled here! something they would seem to say, but 'tis worse than nothing, because it is nothing to the purpose; and indeed what can be said; a man had need to have a special faculty in railing and casting mists before so clear a light; for this Text avows three things which are the very state of the Controversie. 1. That the Scriptures were in the *vulgar* Tongue. 2. That as they were in their own Tongue, so the *Laity* had them in their own hands. 3. That they did read them, and heard them read; there was nothing of any Imperial or Pontifical Power to hinder them, no Monks nor Friars to discourage them and impeach them too. The question being thus cleared, add to this, *ex abundanti*, the practice of these *Bereans* which was *searching*, and that daily, *these Scriptures*, for which they are commended, and that by God himself for so searching; and any sober man would think it

impoſſible for any to gain-ſay it; leſt the people whoſe Souls are precious and immortal in other Countrys enjoy the ſame priviledges as the *Bereans* had, and then if they do not read and hear, and ſearch, their deſtruction will lie at their own doors; but if they be debarred and die in their ſins through ignorance, if they periſh for want of knowledg, their blood will be required elſewhere. Wo be to *the Pariſh-Prieſts*, wo be *to the Biſhops*, wo to the *Prelates*, ſaid one of their own.

The third and laſt is that of *Moſes* in the year of releaſe, *Deut.* 3. 11, 12, 13. *When all Iſrael is gathered together, men, women, children, ſervants, all the ſtrangers within the gates, thou ſhalt read this Law before them in their hearing.* I ſay nothing of the King, who is commanded to have a *Copy of the Law, and to read therein all the days of his life*, Deut. 17. 19. Nor of *Joſhua* the Captain-General, *the Law, the Book of the Law ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou ſhalt meditate therein day and night*, Joſh. 1. 8. Nor the *Chamberlain* of the Queen who was *reading in his Chariot the Book of Iſaiah*, Act. 8. Nor *Peters* exhorting the Twelve Tribes to take heed to walk according to the Scriptures as a *light*, and a more ſure word of Propheſie, than any particular voice from Heaven, though that was moſt ſure alſo, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. Nor *Pauls* bidding Believers *to try all things*, 1 Theſ. 5. 19. which trial muſt be by a Rule, which is the Word of Chriſt, with which Rule they muſt be well acquainted, or elſe they will be but ſorry triers. Theſe and many others I muſt paſs over, and deſire you to conſider what you heard. The adverſaries to this truth know all this full well, but what care they for *Moſes?* tell them that *Moſes* took the blood and ſprinkled the Altar, and *read the Book of the Covenant in the Audience of the People*, Exod. 24. 6, 7. What care they for *Moſes* precept or practice, or threatning? for why, they aſſert that *Papa poteſt diſpenſare contra Moſen*; if you argue from the Apoſtles, why then, *Papa poteſt diſpenſare contra Paulum.* To be ſhort, a learned *Frenchman* (no *Hugenot*) tells us, Dr. *Gloſſatour* upon the Canon-Law avowed by the *Rota* in *Rome*, affirms that the *Pope may diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, againſt the Old Teſtament, againſt the four Evangeliſts, againſt the Law of God*; Review of the Counc. *Trent*, lib. 5. cap. 3. To what purpoſe ſhould I ſtuff my Diſcourſe with Quotations, *Papa poteſt*, the Pope can diſpenſe, when we ſee he doth do it, and it is ſo determined by the Council with an *Anathema* to the gain-ſayer in the buſineſs of Marriage, *Can.* 3. *de Matrimonio, Si quis dixerit Eccleſiam non poſſe diſpenſare in nonnullis, &c.* If *any ſhall affirm the Church cannot diſpenſe in ſome things forbidden about Marriage in Leviticus*, let him be accurſed. If a man reply that theſe Marriages were abominable among the Heathen before *Moſes* was born, and for theſe ſins God caſt them out, and therefore they were ſins againſt the light of Nature; and by that reaſon the Pope cannot diſpenſe: *piſh*, the Anſwer is eaſie, *Papa poteſt diſpenſare contra Rationem*, the Pope can diſpenſe againſt Reaſon. If you reply that *Paul* did deliver to Satan the *Corinthian*, for one of theſe Marriages prohibited;

ted; the Answer is, *Paulus non potuit*, Paul *could not dispense*, but *Peter could*. Thus you see there is no defending of Popery in this and other Controversies, but by setting the Pope above God. The damned Angels would be as God; but here is one that acts Superiority over Christ, *who is God over all, blessed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5.

The second Point to be discussed is this; That the *Bible had never been but for the use of the people of God*; God therefore commanded the Doctrines, Precepts, Promises, Providences, Prophesies to be *written* for them; and therefore they are to read it, and to hear it read; nay more as they were written for the People; so by Gods appointment they were written to the People: therefore the People are not to be debarred from the reading, and hearing of them. A man that denies these Arguments must be (to refresh my self with *J. G*'s language), the *first-born of impudence and non-sensicality*. The two Antecedents I shall prove by parts; the first is proved by *Rom.* 15. 4: Whatsoever *things were written before time were written for our learning*; and the best learning too in the World, that we all through *patience and comfort of the Scriptures* might *have hope*; for our learning, mine and yours, ye Saints at *Rome*, Tent-makers, Artificers, Men, Women, Old, Young; *for your Learning*, Faith, Hope, Patience, waiting upon God, keeping his ways, and comfort in so doing, strength, courage to do, to suffer; and *whatsoever* things Doctrinal, Preceptive, Promissory, Historical, all written, all written *for you*, for *your learning*: Ergo, sure they may read them, and hear them. The next is *Joh.* 20. 31. But these are *written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name*. This Gospel was the last written (our Books tell us) upon the request of some *Asian* Presbyters for the good of the Churches. And against the *Ebionites*, and *Cerinthians*, and such like who denied the Deity and satisfaction of our Lord Jesus; sure it was written for the Churches (and so to all, to the end); and it was written for their Knowledg of, Faith in, and Salvation by our Lord Jesus: these are expressly in the Text. So again, 1 *Joh.* 5. what a Chapter have we there, so sublime and heavenly! yet in the 12. he tells us that these things are written to Believers, to all Believers, that they *might know that they have eternal life*, v. 13. And so begins his Epistle *chap.* 1. when he had spoken something of their fellowship with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, *These things* (saith he) *I write unto you that your joy may be full*, v. 4. *Chap.* 2. 12. *I write to you little Children*; v. 12 to *you fathers*, *young men*, v. 13. The Epistle is high, yet very plain; it treats of the Blessed Trinity, Communion with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, cleansing by his Blood from all Sin, Remission of Sins through his name, the teachings and witness of the holy Spirit, and treats of these things so, that writing of them to all sorts for their good, together with the Doctrines written, is abundantly able to confound the *Romans*, and *Poland* adversaries abroad and at home.

What need I mention any more, that of the King, *Deut.* 17.19. he must write a copy of the Law, and it must be with him, *that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all those words of those statutes to do them. Joshua* must have the Book that *he may observe those precepts and prosper*, Josh. 1. 8, 9. It were endless to name all; I will form the Argument, and go to the next.

Thus it runs; The Truths which God appointed to be written on purpose that the People might read and hear for their Learning, Instruction, Faith, Obedience, Comfort, Joy; these Truths the People ought to read and hear; But the Bible is the Book wherein these Truths are written for that purpose: therefore they are to read and hear the Bible read one to another.

But 2*ly.* as they were written for them, so they were written to them, not to the Clergy, but the People especially. *Rev.* 2. 30. the Seven Epistles to the Seven Churches written to them for their good: *What thou seest, write in a Book and send it to the Seven Churches in Asia*; saith the Lord Christ to *John*, *Rev.* 1. 11. So *Jude* v. 1. So *Peter* his second Epistle, *I write unto you, in both which I stir up your minds by way of remembrance.* Thus he writes to *them* and *for them*, 2 *Epist.* c. 3. *v.* 1, 2. So *Paul*, *to the Saints at* Rome, *to them at* Corinth; *to the faithful in Christ Jesus at* Ephesus. So in the rest as every Child knows. Now when God gives his Truth by Inspiration, and appoints it to be written, as profitable to conviction, to conversion, to instruction in righteousness, that his People may be throughly furnished to every good work and word; what audaciousness, what wickedness is it for any sinful man to interpose and hinder this, and that by a Law, and that under a curse? Shall some mighty Prince signifie his Will to the People under him of the greatest concernment in the World for their advantage, and shall any man stand up and forbid them to read it, or hear it read, and punish them with death for having a transcript in their houses? Search and look into stories whether such a thing was ever done under Heaven. *Ambrose* saith that *Scriptura est Epistola Dei ad creaturas*; and behold here is one that opens his mouth against Heaven, and establisheth wickedness by a Decree, expresly forbidding all men of all degree to read or keep this letter. Is not this he to whom the Dragon gave his Power, his Seat, and great Authority? to whom was given a mouth speaking great words and blasphemies, and to continue two and forty months, *Revel.* 13. Well, the Argument is this, They to whom God appoints the Scriptures to be written they are to read and hear them read; But the Scriptures were thus written to the People: Therefore they are to read them.

The next thing is to evidence our Assertion by the judgment of the Ancient Fathers; but that seems needless, for their own do confess that the Fathers to a man were of our perswasion and practice. *Claud. Espencæus* a learned man tells us of himself, *Equidem in Patribus Orthodoxis*,

doxis per Dei gratiam, &c. Truly, ſaith he, by the Grace of God I have been *converſant in the Orthodox Fathers*, and marvel very much (*non potui non mirari*), that the cuſtom of reading Scriptures by the People ſhould now be accounted *capital* and *peſtilent*, which to the Ancient Orthodox Fathers ſeemed ſo *commodious* and *profitable*, Eſpen. *Com. in Tit. c. 1. pag.* 266. If it be ſaid, That this Biſhop was before the Council of *Trent*, and that poſſibly if he had been in that Convocation he would have been of another mind. There were learned men there more excellent, that might have better informed him. To this I anſwer, I will give you one inſtance for all, a little after that Council, and it is worth your obſervation.

About the year 1560, Biſhop *Jewel* preaching at *Pauls-Croſs*, before a very great and Venerable Aſſembly makes this offer; That if any man alive, or men whatſoever of the Popiſh ſide, could prove by any *one plain ſentence* out of *Scriptures*, or *Fathers*, *ancient Doctors*, or *General Councils*, for the firſt ſix hundred years, any one of the *ſeven and twenty Articles*, which he there rehearſed, he would *then yield and ſubmit.* Among theſe Articles the fifteenth concerns our buſineſs; it runs thus, *If any one can prove by Scriptures, Fathers, Doctors, Councils, for the firſt ſix hundred years, that the Lay-people were forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue, I will yield and ſubmit.* Great diſcourſe (you muſt think) aroſe upon this among all ſorts; for ſuch a man (indeed incomparable) to make ſuch an offer ſo ſeemingly daring, in ſuch a place ſo publick, in ſuch a way as in a publick Ordinance of God, before ſuch an Aſſembly ſo ſolemn and learned, great diſcourſe there was no doubt. Some few months after he comes into the ſame place, and remembers the Audience of his proffer with a great deal of Chriſtian humility; and modeſtly tells them, It was not *vain-glory or ſelf-confidence* (for what was he?) but the vindication of Truth, the Glory of Chriſt, and the Salvation of Souls that had engaged him in this buſineſs. Then and there he repeated the ſame Articles, and renewed the ſame proffer. Whiſperings, cenſurings, railings there were great ſtore in private concerning him, but no man makes an attempt to anſwer him. The Biſhops Apology for the Church of *England* is printed, and tranſlated into ſeveral Languages, diſperſed abroad in *France* and *Spain*, and other parts. One of the many notable home-learned paſſages I have tranſcribed to our purpoſe. *If we be Hereticks* (as they would have us called) *and they be Catholicks*, why *do they not convince and maſter us by the Divine Scriptures*, as Catholick Fathers have always done? Why do they not *lay before us* how we *have gone away from Chriſt, from the Prophets and Apoſtles*, and from the Holy Fathers? why *are they afraid* of this, why *ſtick they at this? I pray you what manner of men be they which fear the judgment of Gods word?* that are afraid of the holy Scriptures? and do prefer before them their own dreams, and cold inventions? and to *maintain their own Traditions*, have defaced and *corrupted* now *theſe many hundred years the*

Ordi-

Ordinances of Christ and the Apostles. This is somewhat close and warm. Well, but still here is a great silence; Dr. *Cole* (late Dean of *Pauls*) a man reputed learned, enters into a Letter-combate with him; the Bishop begs of him to give one Father, one Scripture, one Doctor. *Good* Mr. Dr. (saith he) *do not deceive the People their Souls be precious.* The Dr. sends him back a taunt, a quibble, but never a word of Scripture, Council, or Father: he pretends he was afraid of forfeiting his *recognisance*; No, no, (replys the Bishop) there is no fear of that, why should you fear the forfeit of your *recognisance* more for quoting *Austin* and *Chrysostom*, than for quoting *Horace*, and *Virgil*. At last about five years after out comes Dr. *Harding* and his fellows, and when he and they (for you may be sure the main strength of *Rome* was engaged in this quarrel) come to make their reply to this fifteenth Article, the words are these, I will read them to you in their own expressions; *That the Lay-people were then forbidden to read the Scriptures in their own Tongue, I find it not.* This is honest however, but then the next clause is knavish, *Neither do I find they were commanded to read. Ans.* The Fathers did not take upon them to command, but they pressed the Command of Christ, that clause was impertinent on purpose to beguile the Reader. The Fathers did exhort the People vehemently for reading, and rebuked them sharply for not reading. Give me a roll of Parchment as long as my arm, of the ordinary bredth, and I dare undertake a man shall fill it full within and without with the Sayings of the Fathers to our purpose in a short time, indeed the work is done already to our hands; our Reverend Fathers have wrought hard with great judgment and success, we have (or might have) entred upon their labours. Is it not a fault amongst us that we make no more use of so shining lights, I will name a few. Bishop *Jewel* in his *Reply and Defence. Morton in his Appeal. Whitaker de Scriptura.* Dr. *White* his way and defence. *Cartwright* on *Rhem. Pref.* the Renowned *Du Plessis*, and the great *Chamier*. What an abundance of Sayings of the Fathers have they quoted for the Peoples reading and hearing of the Scriptures within this hundred years and upward! and none hath adventured to gain-say them therein, that I know. But you will say, Do not the learned Papists (for there are learned men amongst them) give some answer to the Scriptures you quote, and the old Doctors too? I answer, there be four Questions I have to speak to, before we come to speak something of translating the Scriptures; and this Question shall be the first, the second is, What Artifices they do use to bring People out of conceit with the Scriptures; the third is, What Objections they usually bring against us; the last, What may be the design in all this. And I shall here make use of the Fathers.

First then, What have they to say? I answer, to that Scripture, which is a principal one, *Joh. 5. 39. Search the Scriptures*, they would fain have it to be the *Indicative Mood*, not the *Imperative*, to be a *practice*, not a *pre-*

a *precept*. Poor men! they would get little by this if it were so, for this practice was lawful and commendable, and then Christ appeals to the Scriptures in which they were practised, to which they did pretend; their own Dr. Bishop *Espencem* thinks it a very great shame, that the *Jews* did practise themselves, and train up their Children in the knowledg of the Scriptures, and Christians did neglect it. Yea, but they would willingly shift it off from being a Command, for then it is still binding, and People that have any sense of God, and their Souls, and any thoughts of another World will conceive it is their Duty, let all the Popes in the World say what they will to the contrary. This is that which pincheth, therefore they would by any shift or wriggle put it off from being a Command; but it will not be. The Fathers take the words in the Imperative, *Utinam omnes faceremus*, Would to God *we would all do that which is written*. *Search the Scriptures*; Origen *in Isa. Hom.* 2. ἐξέτασατε ἁγίας, he commands us, *Search the Scriptures*, Athanas. *Tom.* 2. *pag.* 248. *Com.* ὅταν δοθῇ, when a Commandment is given let us obey our Lord. *Basil. Chrysostom* the same; so *Theophylact* his follower the same, διδάσκων πῶς ἐνοικοῦντα, teaching of them how they might have the Word of God abiding in them: he saith, *Search the Scriptures*, *Theoph. in loc.* There needs no more; for *Jansenius* doth confess it, *Communiter quidem accipitur ut sit imperativi modi*, 'tis commonly taken *for a Command*: *Non dicit legite*, he *doth not say read*, but search; *Non has aut illas sed omnes*, not *this or that*, *but all the Scriptures*, *Law and Prophets*, Conc. *c.* 36. *in loc.* So doth *Maldonate*, *Theophylact*, *Augustine*, *& omnes opinor præter Cyrillum graves authores*. All grave Authors I suppose, except *Cyril*, take these words for a Command, *In eo enim vis Testimonii & gratia Orationis consistit*. Why so, *ad suos ipsorum Scripturas mittit*; Christ *sends them to their own Bibles*, In *quibus omnem illi gloriam suam collocabant*, of *which they chiefly gloried*. As if he should say, *Quandoquidem tantum Scripturis tribuitis*, since you *ascribe so much to the Scriptures*, that in them *you think* to *have eternal life*, search the *Scriptures*, and all things do well agree, they testifie of me. *Chrysost. & Euthymius bene adnotarunt non dicit legite sed scrutamini*, Maldon. *in loc.* So that this Text doth stand for a Commmand from Christ, and the countermand stands (among others) for a brand of Antichrist. But soft, not so hasty; *Stapleton* and others say, Christ there speaks to the Scribes and Pharisees, and they were to search the Scriptures *by their Office*: This they prove by *v.* 33. *You sent unto John*; now the Scribes and Pharisees sent unto *John*, therefore to them he speaks. *Anſ.* The Chapter speaks not a word of the Scribes and Pharisees, but of the *Jews*; besides, the Scribes and Pharisees did not send unto *John* but the *Jews*. The Text is expres, *Joh.* 1. 19. *The Jews sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem to John.*

As to the Fathers urging the Bible upon the People, they say, 'Tis true; but say they (*Sixtus Senensis*, and others), *Patres dispensarunt, indulse-*

dulserunt libertatem, *Anſ.* Out upon it, a meer ſorgery to cheat the ſimple, *Venis & indulgentia locum non habet ubi non præceſſerit prohibitio*, That is *Chamiers* Anſwer, an Indulgence doth preſuppoſe a Prohibition. How could the *Fathers indulge that* that was *never forbidden?* Was the reading or hearing of the Bible ever forbid by the Fathers or Chriſtian Magiſtrates in their time? Indeed *Antiochus* did burn it, and *Julian* ſcoffed at it, and *Dioclesian* did burn it alſo; but of Chriſtians never any did ſo, the deſtroyers and prohibiters of Scriptures are of another ſort; they do like the Pagan Princes, *Antiochus* and *Dioclesian*.

But they plead the Fathers; They ſay the Fathers (as *Jerom* and *Auſtin*) ſay the Scriptures are obſcure and hard to be underſtood; and from thence infer, That in the judgment of the Fathers the Lay-people ſhould not meddle with them. *Anſ.* 'Tis true, moſt of them urge this, but very ſophiſtically, and indeed wickedly. *Auſtin* ſaith that the Scripture like a familiar friend ſpeaketh thoſe things it containeth to the heart, *Doctorum & Indoctorum*, of the *Learned*, and *the Unlearned*, *Epiſt.* 3. The Scriptures are eaſie to be underſtood, and expoſed to the capacity of every Servant, Plowman, Artificer; ſo *Chryſoſtome*, *Cyril*, *Jerom*, *Iſidore*, and indeed all to the ſame purpoſe. True they ſay (as we do), That there are ſome things obſcure to ſtir up diligence, frequency, prayer. Some Scriptures are dark, therefore Chriſtians muſt pray more, and read more attentively, diligently; that is the Inference of the Fathers; Therefore they muſt not read at all; that is the Inference of the Jeſuits. What ſophiſtry, how bald is this, fit to be hiſſed out of the company of rational men. *Chryſoſtome* is moſt earneſt upon all ſorts, Artificers, Tradeſmen, Men, Women, Young, Old, to be much in Reading and Hearing, anſwers all their ſhifts, tells them that they have more need than others, than Students, than Monks, becauſe they are *in the midſt of many temptations*. Our Divines cite him much, the Compiler of our Homilies, quotes ſcarce any Father beſides. What ſay the Jeſuits to this? why ſome ſay, He dealt like a *Pulpit-man*, not *like a Reader in a Desk*, like an *Orator*, not a *Diſputant*. Others, He was a vehement man. Others, That he ſpake Hyperbolically; that is, He ſpake more than was needful. Whereas the truth is, The Angels would ſooner want words wherewith to commend, than the Bible want worth to commend it ſelf. But of all men the *Rhemiſts* are moſt impudent, who would make as if *Chryſoſtome* were ſo vehement only or mainly to take People off from Cards and Dice, and Stage-plays; whereas *Chryſoſtomes* great buſineſs is to take them from their excuſes of their Families, Trades, Callings; *Rhemiſts* Preface to their Annotations, with *Cartwrights* Anſwer, ſee there at large. To conclude this, the Fathers ſpeak of the Scriptures according to the Scripture; *viz.* That they are a *Light*, a *Lamp*; a *Light* that *ſhineth*, that they give *Underſtanding* to the *ſimple*: If men ſpeak not according to them it is becauſe there is no light in them, yet theſe men reject all. Some few are conſtrained to

confeſs

confeſs that in points generally to be believed the Scriptures are plain; but yet they will not yield at any hand that they ſhall come into the hands of the People, you ſhall hear their reaſons by and by.

The ſecond Queſtion is, What Artifices their Learned Men do uſe to debaſe the Scriptures, that the People may have a vile eſteem of them, bring them to diſdain and loath them? I anſwer, many ways by Word and Deed; firſt by Word, Shall I ſay they diſparage them? Sure enough, they blaſpheme, they call them *a dead Letter*, *a dumb Judg*, *Theologiam Atramentariam*, Inken Divinity; (do you hear ye Quakers who were your Tutour) a *Lesbian Rule*, a *Noſe of Wax without the Pope* (ſaith *Car. Hoſius*) they have no *more Authority than Æſops Fables*, non plus Authoritatis quam Æſopi Fabulas: Here is a *Rabſhakey* whom the *Babyloniſh* King hath preferred to a Red-Hat to blaſpheme the Living God; the ſame man compares *David's Pſalms* to *Ballades*, with a verſe out of *Horace*, *Scribimus indocti doctiq; Poemata paſſim*; which the excellent Biſhop Engliſheth thus, *we write Ballades Tag and Rag.* Dr. *White* in the way tells us that *Pereſius* ſaid, that he thought verily it was the Devils invention *to permit the people to read the Bible*; Is not this enough to ſcare and affright poor ſouls from touching it, or attending to it? *Martin. Pereſius de Trad. p.* 44. And *Thyrræus* ſaith, that he knew certain Husbandmen *poſſeſſed of the Devil*, becauſe being *but Husbandmen they were able to diſcourſe of the Scriptures: Thyrræus de Dæmoniac. c.* 21. *Theſ.* 257. Methinks here I have an *idea* of a Frier Preaching, that *Reading Scripture is the way to be poſſeſſed of the Devil.*

2. By Deeds and Practice, and that many ways.

1. They *cry up* the good of Ignorance; they tell us it is more *rewardable* to be *ignorant than knowing*, they require no knowledg of the things we pray for: The Jeſuites tell us after a long harangue in ſome things impertinent, and in others very falſe, that devout People may, and ought, in their *ancient right*, *ſtill uſe their Latin Prayers*, Beads, and Primars as ever before, *notwithſtanding* what *Paul* ſaith, in the 1 *Cor.* 14. And that they doubt not but it is acceptable to God, and available in all *their neceſſities*; *nay more*, *that they pray with great conſolation* of ſpirit, and with as great devotion and affection, nay oftentimes *more than they* that Pray *in the Vulgar Tongue.* Well, and what Prayers be theſe? Why they be Prayers, Pſalms, and holy Words: They are the *Pater Noſter*, the *Ave Maria*, the *Creed*, *Our Ladies Mattins*, and the *Letanies*, and the like: Oh! the impudence of men, that have made their Faces harder than a Rock, to Print ſuch things as theſe: *Rhem. Annot.* on the 1 *Cor.* 14. So alſo they require no ability to profeſs their Faith, if they were to ſuffer for it; if a Catholick *called before the Commiſſioners*, *hath courage to ſay* I am *a Catholick*, he *defendeth himſelf ſufficiently* (though he can ſay no more) and that I will *dye a Catholick*; But what if the Commiſſioners ask him a reaſon of his Faith, he anſwers enough, by telling them that *the Church can give them a rea-*

ſon of all their demands, *Rhem. Annot. Luke* 12. 11. They ſay that Ignorance in moſt things, is *beſt of all*,--- to know nothing is to *know all things*. Hoſius.

2. They cry up to the skies an Implicite Faith (this is diſtinct from the other, though near a-kin) this is the Colliers Faith, and doth wonders. The Story is, the Collier was ſick, and being at the point of death, he was tempted of the Devil what his Faith was; the Collier anſwered, *I believe and dye in the Faith of Chriſts Church*: Being demanded by the Devil, what the Faith of the Church was, *that Faith* (quoth he) *that I believe in*; and thus clearly baffled and non-pluſſed the Devil. He put him to flight ſaid *Staphylus*, I ſhould not have believed this Story (ſaith my Author) upon the report of ſuch a baſe companion as *Staphylus*; but when I ſaw the ſame conceit ſet forth as gravely by Learneder *Cleardes* than that renegate (ſo Biſhop *Jewel* calls him); then I conceived that the Colliers Faith was *Canonized* for the Papiſts Creed: Theſe learned men were no leſs than *Alb. Pighius*, *Hierarch. lib.* 1. *cap.* 5. *p.* 38. and *Hoſius cont. Proleg. Brentii*, *lib.* 3. *p.* 136. with two other conſiderable men. Dr. *Cole* ſhall conclude this, with what he did once conclude the convocation at *Weſtminſter*, in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*: The Story in ſhort is this. A Diſputation is appointed by the Council at *Weſtminſter* (ſaith *Fuller* in his Hiſtory); Nine Popiſh Biſhops and Doctors on that ſide; Eight Proteſtant Doctors on the other ſide, Sr. *Nicholas Bacon* Lord Keeper, Moderatour: The firſt queſtion was about ſervice in an unknown Tongue, the firſt Day paſſed with the Proteſtants; the ſecond Day the Popiſh Biſhops and Doctors fell to cavilling againſt the order agreed on: (Alas what ſhould they do, they could not now, *Petere argumenta ex officinis carnificum*;) They fell to ſaucineſs as well as diſorder, the meeting is diſſolved, Dr. *Cole* ſtands up and tells that honourable Aſſembly, thus with a loud voice, *I tell you* (ſaith he) *that Ignorance is the Mother of devotion*: So ſaid the *Valentinians* of old, as *Irenæus* tells us, that the Ignorance of Truth is knowledg, *lib.* 2. *c.* 19.

3. They have one trick more to debaſe the Scriptures, and dull the edge of peoples affections to them, ſome of their Doctors write moſt unworthy things of the Bible, as before; theſe they applaud, that ſo they may inſtil ſlily and inſenſibly into the minds of men by their Authority, a very coarſe eſteem of the Word of God: As for example, *Catharinus* teſtifieth of Cardinal *Cajetan*, that he denied the laſt chapter *of St. Mark*, *ſome parcels of St. Luke*, *the Epiſtle to the* Hebrews, the Epiſtle of *James*, the ſecond Epiſtle of *Peter*, *the ſecond and third Epiſtles of* John, and the *Epiſtle of* Jude; this *Man they applaud* very highly, call him the *incomparable Divine*, fill their people with high *admirations of him*, and then publiſh in their Books theſe things; and ſo inſtil by drops an evil opinion of the Scriptures: And if the Proteſtants object this to them, they put it off, ſaying, he was but a *private*

vate Doctor, what is that to *their Church*. The Priests and Friers tell the people what *Hosius* and others their admired men say of the Scriptures, *a dark, lame, mute, dumb, sorry Book*; and all this to disparage the Holy Truth of God, and to keep poor Souls in Ignorance, which they do by this means, both Priest and People. Their very Priests understand not their own Mass-Books; A Young Man within these three Months, entered into Discourse with some Priests at *Malaga* in *Spain*, he saluted them in Latin, and proposed some Questions in Latin to them, they understood never a Word. Archbishop *Spotswood* tells us in his History of *Scotland*, that the Cardinal persecuted men in *Angus*, for reading the *New-Testament*: And 'tis said the Ignorance of these times was so great, that even the *Priests did think that the New-Testament was one of* Martin Luthers *Books*, *H. Se. ad annum* 1544. He tells us also of a great contention among the Church-men, whether the *Pater Noster* might be said to the Saints; it was brought to the University, they, some of the Doctors said it might be said to God *formaliter*, to the Saints *materialiter*; to God *principaliter*, to the Saints *minus principaliter*; to God *capiendo stricte*, to Saints *capiendo large*: The Doctors meet several times, and not agreeing, it was referred to a Provincial Synod to be decided. When the Synod convened, the question was agitated again, at last it was resolved that the *Pater Noster* might be said to saints. *Hist. Scot. Anno* 1553. 'Tis impossible to conceive what a thick fogg, and mist of ignorance and darkness was upon the Souls of the people; I will mention but one Story from Dr. *White* upon his own experience, it is this; he saw and learned (dwelling among them) how they said their Prayers; the Creed thus, *Creezum zuum Patrum onitentem creatorum ejus anicum Dominum nostrum qui cum sons Virgini Mariæ crixus fixus Douche Pilati.* and so on, to *Eccli Catholi remisserne peccaturum communiorum, obliviorum bitam* and *turnam* again. It would make a mans heart tremble (saith my Author) at their most horrid ignorance; yet to hear them pronounce their Prayer it moves laughter, and I confess upon this account I durst not Preach it: In him you may see a great deal more of this pitiful stuff, *The way to the True Church*, in the Preface to the Reader. The Jesuit in his *Answer* calls him to an account for this; but in his *Defence* he tells the Jesuit that is the case of the better sort as well as the poor, they are all ignorant, and say their Prayers much at one rate, and this saith he I will stand to, if all the Seminaries in *England* had it in chase: My experience of some (saith he) allows me to speak that the Ignorance is general. *Defence c.* 12. He asked an Ancient Woman what Jesus Christ was; She told him she could not tell, but sure it was some good thing, it would not have been with the Lady else in her Creed; but no more.

4. Lastly, They take this way to put down the Scriptures, *&c.* by destroying and burning them, and those that love them: I will give three or four instances, the first, King *Henry* the Eighth writes to the

French King for Licence to Print the *Bible* in *English* in *Paris*, because there was ſtore of Paper and good Workmen, as alſo to *Bonner* then Leiger in *France* to further it; this was by the means of *Cromwell*, at great charges it is effected; but by the means of *Gardiner* and his fellows ſeized and burned openly in the Maulbert place in *Paris*, 2500 Bibles burned at one fire. See *Fox* his *Martyr.* there is much more to this purpoſe.

Upon the perſecution of the Duke of *Guiſe* againſt the Proteſtants, at *Amiens* all the *Bibles*, *Teſtaments*, *Pſalters*, were ſought for and openly burnt, at *Troys* the *Bibles* were all rent and torn in pieces, at *Angees* they openly burnt the *Bibles* in the Market-place; one fair gilt *Bible* was hung upon an Halberd, and carried in Proceſſion, the Papiſts ſaying, Behold, Truth hanged, the Truth of the *Hugenots*, the Truth of all the Devils, with much collected by Mr. *Clark* in his *Martyrol.* In *Iceland* (within memory) the *Bible* was dragged, kennelled, cut, torn, ſtampt upon. Biſhop *Jewel* tells of a Martyr in Q: *M.* pleaded the Scripture before the Biſhop in his own defence; the Biſhop turning to a Juſtice ſaid, nay, if he prates of the *Bible*, we ſhall never have done; *habemus Legem*, we have a Law (ſaid he) and by our Law he ought to die. *Rep.* to *Cole.* *John Porter* a young Man, reads in the *Bible* ſet up in *Pauls* by *Bonner* in the Lord *Cromwell*'s time; when *Cromwell* was dead, *Bonner* ſends for him, accuſes him for expounding the *Bible* to the people, *Porter* denies any ſuch thing; *Bonner* ſends him to *Newgate* where he is loaded with Irons, hands and leggs, and a Collar of Iron about his neck, by a friends means to the Keeper he is ſomewhat eaſed, and put among the Felons, whom he reproves, and inſtructs, being well acquainted with the Scriptures; he is complained of, the Biſhop commands him into the Dungeon, 'tis thought he was put into the Engine called the Devil in the Neck: In the night he was heard to groan ſadly, in the morning found dead.

A poor Bookſeller in *Avignion* was burned to Aſhes, for ſetting to ſale ſome *French Bibles*, his defence worthy the reading, his queſtions utterly ſilencing the Biſhop of *Aix*, with the reſt of the Prelates; they gnaſhed upon him with their Teeth, and cried, To the fire preſently: He was led to his execution with two *Bibles* about his neck, one hanging before, the other behind, as ſhewing the cauſe of his condemnation; ſo the good Man and the *Bibles* were burnt together. *Fox Mir. H.* 8.

A Woman of *Sanſay* in *France*, was accuſed by her Servant for having a *Bible* in her Houſe, in reading whereof was her whole delight; the Maid Servant complains of this to the Jeſuites, the Jeſuites complain to the Judges, ſhe was apprehended, and impriſoned; the Judges told her, if ſhe would confeſs upon the Scaffold that ſhe had broken the Law, and caſt her *Bible* into the fire, ſhe ſhould have her life: We would have you (ſaid they) imagin it to be but Paper, and you may buy

buy another, only throw this into the fire to give the Jesuites content, thus they laboured to perswade her for the space of two hours: *What a scandal shall I give said she to the People to burn Gods Book? No certainly, I will never do it, I will rather burn my Body than my Bible*: Upon this she was committed close Prisoner, fed with bread and water, at last condemned to be set upon the Scaffold, her Bible burnt before her face; her self to be strangled, her body to be dragged through the Streets to a dunghil, which was accordingly done.

A Woman in *Ireland* required by *Fitz Patrick* to burn her *Bible*, She told him that she would rather die than burn her *Bible*; whereupon the Sabbath day morning after this, She and her Husband were cruelly murthered: But the murtherer, tormented in Conscience, and dogged (as he conceived) and haunted with apparitions of them, with inward horrour pined away. *Cls. Mar. Fran. Ireland.*

There is no end of these sad Stories, Dr. *Story* shall conclude; Thou pratest (said he to a Martyr) of the *Bible*, bibble, babble, all is bibble babble, thou shalt prate at a Stake. So much of the second Question.

The Third is this, What Objections do they make against reading, and having Scripture? They are men of Learning, some of them give some Reason for their proceedings.

Answ. They do so, and you shall hear them fairly proposed, I will not wrong them.

The first is this; Cast not holy things to *Dogs*, *nor Pearls before Swine*; therefore the People must not have the use of *Bibles*. Answer, Verily this Argument is so horribly injurious to the Wisdom and Mercy of God, and so inhuman and barbarous to the rationality of Man, that one would think it were rather slanderously and designedly imposed upon them, then proposed by them; But it is notoriously true in all their Books: *Harding* and his fellows alledg it in their Answer to Bishop *Jewel*. *Hosius* doth the same also. The Jesuites in their Preface to the *Rhem. Annot.* but more subtilly and slily; and are rebuked sufficiently by Mr. *Car.* *Salmeron* and *Costerus* gives the same reason why the People are not to know the Church-Traditions, they must be kept lockt and safe in the Popes Breast; the Pope is not to let the people know Traditions, or at least doth not, because Holy things must not be thrown to Dogs. *Canus* doth the same, and because he speaks out, I will write his words, *Si Apostoli quibus formis sacramenta essent conficienda, quibusq; ritibus administranda, aliaq; id genus religionis secreta passim vulgo tradidissent, quid esset aliud quam adversus Christi legem sanctum dare canibus & inter porcos spargere margaritas? imo quid esset aliud quam omnia mysteria Christianæ Religionis abolere? nec enim mysterium est quod ad populares aures effertur. Hæ itaq; prima ratio est cur Apostoli quædam sine scripto tradiderunt, nempe, ne aut ab ethnicis irriderentur sacra nostra aut*

vulgo

vulgo etiam fidelium venirent in contemptum: The long and ſhort is this, That the Apoſtles *did by word of mouth deliver the ſecrets* of the *Goſpel to ſome men*, and did *not write and preach the whole* of Faith and Duty to the Churches; for if they had done ſo, they had gone againſt the Command of Chriſt, who ſaith, *Give not holy things to Dogs, and caſt not Pearls before Swine*; *Can. Lib.* 3. *c.* 3. *com. Loc.* Thus the poor People whoſe Souls are immortal and precious, the People that are the Church of God, for whom Chriſt died to redeem with his Blood, for whom, and to whom the Scriptures were on ſet-purpoſe written, muſt have nothing; not the Scriptures, becauſe holy things muſt not be given to Dogs, nor Traditions (which alſo contain matters of Faith and Worſhip) becauſe Pearls muſt not be caſt to Swine.

Mr. *Harding* and they with him tell us, that whereas the Hebrew Letters had no Vowels, the Seventy Elders only could read, and the people were kept from reading of it, as it is thought by the ſpecial Providence of God, that precious ſtones ſhould not be caſt before Swine, *Reply to the fifteenth Article*, a notorious daring untruth, for whether they had points or not is not to the queſtion; ſure enough the people could Read, for they were expreſly commanded to Write the Words of the Law: *Deut.* 11. And they could Write a Bill of Divorce. *Paulus Fagius* ſaith, from the *Rabbins*, that through the whole Countrey every Town had a School, and that in *Jeruſalem* there were ſome hundreds of Schools; And in ſo many Schools was there no Scholar did know his Letters? For him to ſay they could not Read, and that by a ſpecial Providence they were kept from it, and that, becauſe holy things ſhould not be caſt to Dogs; What daring men are theſe? But the truth is, they will adventure upon any thing to ſerve their own turn, by keeping the people in midnight doleful Darkneſs.

Their ſecond Obection is, The People will pervert the Scriptures, therefore they are juſtly prohibited; the good Old Gentleman out of his Fatherhood, takes away the Knife out of his Childrens hands, they will abuſe themſelves and cut their fingers.

Anſw. This Objection is an Hundred year old, and Thirty to boot, and every-where among their Biſhops and Jeſuites to be found; but I ſtood amazed to read it of late, in a reply to Dr. *S.* It ſeems they think it is a very ſharp Argument: Alas, one of the Martyrs in Q. *M.* broke the edge of it, indeed batter'd it all to pieces. The Story in ſhort is this; *Stephen Gratwich* convented before Dr. *Watſon* Biſhop of *Winchester*, in St. *Maries Overies* in *Southwark*, tells the Biſhop of his cruelty, in taking away the *New Teſtament* from him, which he had for the health of his Soul, which all men ought to have for their Souls comfort; and ſo he did treat them more like brute beaſts, than Chriſtian men: No (quoth the Biſhop) we will uſe you as we will uſe the Child; for if the Child will hurt himſelf with the Knife, we will take away the Knife from him:

So

So because you will damn your Soul with the *Bible*, you shall not have it. My Lord quoth *Gratwick*, this is a simple Argument to maintain and cover your sin, are not you ashamed to make the Word the cause of our damnation? But if your Argument be good, you may take away from us our Meat and Drink, because some men do abuse them; and you may make an Argument to take away all other mercies as well as the Scriptures: My Lords, quoth *Winchester*, we lose time, this fellow is perverse, he speaks nothing but Sophistry, we shall get no advantage against him. Have at ye now. Wilt thou recant? I will pronounce sentence. There, there it is, Who shall stand before this Argument?

But if perverting Scriptures, be any reason for the non-reading of them; then of all men in the World, the Popes, Cardinals, Priests, Jesuites, should be prohibited; of all men they should never touch a *Bible*, instances are many; I will present you with a few. Dr. *Harding* and the *Lovainists* with him argue thus; The Son of Man came not to destroy, but to seek and save that which is lost, *Ergo*, in the Sacrament the Accidents of Bread and Wine remain without their Subjects. The Axe may not boast himself against him that lifteth it up; *Ergo*, no Man may dare to judg the Pope, if he leads thousands of Souls to Hell, no Man may mutter, or say, *Domine, cur ita fecisti*. To the pure all things are pure, to the unclean all things are unclean; *Ergo*, It is not lawful for Priests to Marry. Give not Holy things to Dogs, *Ergo*, Prayers must be in a strange Tongue the people do not understand. I will sprinkle clean Water upon you; *Ergo*, the Priest must sprinkle the people with Holy Water. Christ said, Without me, ye can do nothing; *Ergo*, the Bishop alone must consecrate the Church. *Paul* saith, the Rock was Christ; *Ergo*, the Altar must be of Stone. The Earth is the Lords, the round World, and all that dwell therein; *Ergo*, the Host or Sacramental Bread must be round. God made the Sun to rule the day, and the Moon the Night; *Ergo*, the Dignity of the Pope is Fifty six times bigger then the Emperours Dignity. The Thief upon the Cross, repented himself of his Life; *Ergo*, the Priest at Mass must fetch a sigh, and knock his Breast. *Judas* kissed Christ; *Ergo*, the Priest must kiss the Altar. Take the Money in the mouth of the Fish, and pay for me and thee; *Ergo*, the Pope is the Head of the Church. *Babylon* is a Cup of Gold in the hand of the Lord; *Ergo*, the Chalice must be of Silver or Gold. Thus I have given you a full dozen of instances, of their horrible abusing of the Scripture; and if it were serviceable I could furnish you with a dozen more, the greatest abusers of the Scripture that ever were, and the greatest blasphemers that ever were, in applying that to ignorant sinful men, which is peculiar to the Lord Jesus: As the Pope is the Light that cometh into the World, and the Ambassadours of *Sicilie* thus supplicate the Pope *Tu qui tollis peccata mundi*, Oh thou that takest away the Sins of the World, have mercy upon us;

Oh

Oh thou that takeſt away the ſins of the World, *Dona nobis pacem*, Grant us thy peace. And theſe (with much more that might be added) I ſay theſe illogical non-ſenſical inferences, and blaſphemous applications are aſſerted, by Biſhop *Jewel* at *Pauls* Croſs; and *Chemnitius. Exam.*

3. They Object, That the Reading of the Scriptures or hearing them read breeds Hereſie, Therefore they ought not to have the uſe of them: This Objection is common amongſt all their writers; the Council of *Trent* (as was above ſaid) ſaith that the Scripture do more harm than good; what harm they do not tell, though they did reſolve to prohibit them, and did ſpightfully ſpeak againſt them; yet in their Decree they durſt ſay no more than that they did harm in general, and they could not for ſhame and policy ſay leſs, for then they had not mentioned any pretence for their prohibition: Why did not they ſpeak out and name the harm they did, by whom, in what Countrey, to whom, in what particulars? And all their ground is experience, *cum experimento manifeſtum ſit*; But whoſe experience is this? None ſure, but their own they found and felt, and feared more would follow, that the Scriptures had diſcovered to the World their Tyranny, Hereſie, and Idolatry, their Pride, Covetouſneſs, Filthineſs, and innumerable Villanies? This was the experience, and this is the riſe of their rage and enmity, and continueth ſo to this day amongſt ſome of them it may be feared to ſpiteful perſecution againſt knowledg.

Wo be to our Pariſh Prieſts, wo be to our Biſhops, wo be to our Prelates, ſaid a Learned Man of their own; yea, wo be to them indeed, they have not only taken away the Key of Knowledg, but they reproach it to be the key of Hereſie: Hereticks (ſaith Dr. *Harding* and his complices) ſuck in the venom of Hereſie out of the Scriptures; *Ergo*, if the people read the Scriptures, they will prove Hereticks. This is the common cry of them all, and Biſhop *Jewel* ſhall anſwer them all, the concluſion is this; every Man may read the Jeſuites and Prieſts Books, but Gods Book they may not read; every Man may read the Jeſuites and Prieſts Books without danger, but the Book of God they cannot read without danger; would you know the reaſon (ſaith he)? the Reaſon is this, Gods Book is full of Truth, and their Books are full of Lies.

The Scripture breeds Hereſie, even as much as Light breeds Darkneſs, or Phyſick Diſeaſes; yea, but men do pervert them! that is anſwered before: Yea, but now Hereſies are abroad, therefore it is not ſafe! And were there not Tradition-mongers and Hereſies in Chriſts time? Were not falſe Teachers very many and in very many points, and thoſe very dangerous and deſtructive in the Apoſtles time? Were there not ſome that denied the reſurrection of the body, and turned all into an Allegory, of a riſing within us, then as well as now? And of late,

late the *Familists* and *Quakers?* Did not some deny the Deity of our Lord Jesus, the *Ebionites* and others then, as well as the *Socinians* now? Did not some let go the Head Christ and introduce a wicked practice of Worshipping of Angels, through the pretence of Humility, *Holding not the head*, *Col.* 2. Were there none that did overthrow the foundation, (if making Christ of none effect will overthrow the Foundation then sure they did it) by Justification by Works as a less principal cause. Certainly there were all these and others, yet the Apostles did never forbid the People reading Scriptures, for fear they might be infected. As if an Antidote should cause or occasion, (if you will have it so) I say occasion an infection; the Apostles did the contrary; *John* bids them *Try the spirits*; and *Paul* bids them *Try all things*; and *Jude* exhorts them *To contend earnestly for the Faith delivered once to the Saints: Take unto them the sword of the spirit which is the word of God*, Ephes. 6. 17.

It is to little boot to light up a Candle where the Sun shines; what should I name the Fathers, were there not Heresies in their times? Doth not *Irenæus*, and after him *Epiphanius* name them in numbers eighty? doth not *Austin* after them and others reckon up about eighty? Did they now forbid the People to read and search the Scripures? The clean contrary every one knows that knows any thing of them. Nay, they chide them because they were not skilful: The *Manichees and Heretick deceive the simple, but if we had our senses exercised to discern good and evil, we might easily refute them*; *how shall we have our senses but by the use of the Scriptures, and frequent hearing.* Chrysost. *Hom.* 8. *ad Heb. Nothing can deceive those that search the Scriptures, for they are a light.* Theoph. *de Lazaro.* ὥσπερ ἰχνεύει σοφισάμενος, *which shining the thief is discovered*; ὁ κλέπτης φαίνεται ἢ ἐνέκρυπτεν. *We must read the Scriptures*, omni studio, *that we may be skilful exchangers* (trapezitæ) *to discern between Gold and Copper.* So *Hierome* long before *Theophyl. Malleo Scripturarum, &c.* that we *beat out the brains of Heresies with the mallet of the Scriptures*, idem. It were tedious to tyth the Quotations of the Fathers to this purpose. The Scripture breeds Heresies; Nay, saith *Irenæus* 1450 years since to the mad, fantastick *Valentinians*; *Hæc omnia contulit*, &c. *The Ignorance of the word of God is the cause of all these Heresies.* This the holy learned Father pithily discourseth in many Chapters, *Lib.* 4. especially from the 11*th.* to the 17*th.* to confound the *Marcionites*, *Carpocratians* and other *Gnosticks*, That *it was the same God and Father Almighty Maker of the World then and now, and the same Lord Jesus the Saviour both now and then. That* Abraham *was saved by faith in Christ. Nemo cognoscit filium nisi pater, nemo cognoscit patrem nisi filius & quibuscunq; filius revelaverit; revelaverit enim non solum in futurum dictum est, quasi tunc inceperit verbum revelare Patrem cum de Maria natus, sed communiter per totum tempus positum est; ab initio enim filius assistens suo Plasmati revelat omnibus Patrem, quibus vult & quod vult & quemadmodum vult Pater*

& propter hoc in omnibus & per omnia unus Deus Pater, unus filius, & unus ſpiritus, una fides & una ſalus omnibus credentibus in eum. Cap. 14. *Propheta cum ergo eſſet* Abraham *& videret in ſpiritu diem adventus Domini & Paſſionis diſpoſitionem, per quem ipſe & omnes ſimiliter ut ipſe credidit, credunt Deo ſalvari inciperent, vehementer exultavit, novit, quod Deo beneplacuit filium ſuum dilectum & unigenitum præſtare ſacrificium in noſtram redemptionem,* lib. 4. c. 13.

And he ſaith alſo before, That the accurſed Hereticks *Gnoſticks* of all ſorts and names, did beget their Hereſies and ſpread them from the ignorance of the Scripture, *Hæc omnia contulit eis ignorantia Scripturarum & diſpoſitionis Dei:* ſc. in the Scriptures; *Nos autem & cauſam differentiæ Teſtamentorum, & rurſum unitatem & conſonantiam ipſorum, in his quæ deinceps futura ſunt referemus,* l. 3 c. 12.

But laſtly, If the Scriptures muſt not be read by the People, becauſe they will prevert them, and engender Hereſies, then of all the men in the World, Learned men, the Clergy, Popes, Cardinals, Jeſuits, Prieſts, Academicks, Miniſters ſhould not read them, for he muſt be a great ſtranger in Hiſtory, Primitive and Modern, and in common experience. Who doth not know, that theſe men in all ages have been the broachers of Errors and Hereſies, the falſe Apoſtles, the Miniſters of Satan? the *Gnoſticks* their Ring-leaders were they not learned? *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Photinus*, *Macedonius*, and the reſt; they were either Presbyters or Biſhops. Come to our times, look into *Poland* and *Tranſylvania* within theſe eighty years paſt, the *Socinuſſes*, Uncle *Lelius*, and Nephew *Fauſtus*, *Crellius*, *Smalcius*, *Volkelius*, and the reſt? the Miniſters of *Tranſylvania* were they Lay-people? Who did expound the ninth of *Iſaiah* and applied it to *Hezekiah*? and the 53 *Iſaiah* and apply it to *Jeremiah*? or the fifth of *Micah*, and apply it to *Zorobabel*? Who invented ſuch a trick as to ſay theſe Texts might be applied to Jeſus Chriſt, and ought to be ſo; *modo eminentiori*, a villainous trick in it ſelf, and very apt to deceive young Students? Who are thoſe that affirm, publickly affirm, That *Abraham* was not ſaved by Faith in Chriſt? are they Lay-men, they would take it very hainouſly if a man ſhould not ſay that they were learned men, admirable and incomparable men. Did the People in *Holland* revive and vent *Pelagianiſm*? Do the People in *England* contrary to the Scriptures and the Doctrine of the Church vent *Photinianiſm* or *Pelagianiſm*? I have reaſon to believe that brain-ſick *Quakeriſm* did not ariſe from the People, but from learned Seducers, that have a myſtery amongſt them to do any thing, or ſpread any falſity, ſo it be for the advance of the Catholick cauſe. *Sabbatarianiſm*, for the Saturdays Sabbath. *Antiſabbatarianiſm* againſt the Lords-day, *Jure Divino*. *Anabaptiſm* hath riſen from and been ſupported by men of Learning.

The fourth and laſt Objection they make, or that I ſhall name, is the *obſcu-*

obſcurity of the Scriptures. The *Scriptures* are obſcure and dark, therefore *the Lay-people* ſhall not read them. This alſo is a common thredbare baffled Argument, how do they prove the Antecedent? Why, *There are ſome things dark and hard to be underſtood in Pauls Epiſtles.*

Anſ. Though there be ſome few dark places in *Paul* and other Scriptures, yet generally they are plain, and there is nothing dark in thoſe few places that concerns Faith and Holineſs; but the ſame is abundantly plain in other Texts; ſome places are obſcure, moſt places are plain and facile: *Ergo*, the People muſt read none at all; this is the proper but moſt abſurd Inference of the Jeſuits. Some Texts are ſomewhat dark, therefore the people ſhould read the oftner, pray the more, compare Text with Text, conſult and confer the more, be well skilled and ſetled in the Doctrines of Faith and Practice in plainer places the more. Theſe Inferences are proper and natural, but that they ſhould not read at all is ſuch a wild doltiſh *non ſequitur*, that nothing can be more.

David ſaith, *That they are a Light, a Lamp, that they enlighten the eyes, give underſtanding to the ſimple:* Yet how little was there of the Bible in *Davids* times, no more but the five Books of *Moſes*, and two or three other Books, and theſe moſtly Hiſtorical; what a light and glory ſhining is there now by the Acceſſion of *Solomon*, the Hiſtory of the Kings, the Prophets, Evangeliſts, Apoſtles? and yet ſhall bold men reproach them, and ſay, They are dark? 'Twill be tedious to you and me to quote Fathers in this Point; take two or three; *Univerſæ Scripturæ & Propheticæ & Evangelicæ, ſunt in aperto; & ſine ambiguitate & ſimiliter ab omnibus audiri poſſunt:* Prophets and Apoſtles are without ambiguity, and may be heard (underſtood) of all. *Irenæus lib. 2. c. 46.* He diſcourſeth againſt the *Valentinians*, and the other *Gnoſticks*, who would pick out a myſtical meaning where it never was; and if that they met with any number, what wild work would they make with it for their fantaſtick *Æones*; much at the rate as the Papiſts out of *Paſce oves* collect the Popes Supremacy, and out of the Eighth *Pſalm*, *Thou haſt put all things under his feet:* ſc. *Sub pedibus Pontificis Romani*, under the Popes feet. *Pecora campi*; The beaſts of the field; that is, *Men on earth*, the fiſh of the Sea; that is, *Souls in Purgatory. Volucres cæli*, the birds of Heaven; that is, the *Souls in Heaven Canonized by the Pope.* Go to, ſaith *Irenæus* to the *Gnoſticks*, with your wild notions: So ſay we to our Adverſaries, *Scripturæ in aperto ſunt*; The ſenſe of the Scriptures is plain enough. So *Clem. Alexand.* perſwades the Heathen to leave their Fables, which are much like the Popiſh Legends; and their Statues which they worſhipped with uncouth Ceremonies, like the Popiſh Images; and invites them to Heavenly knowledg in the Prophets and Apoſtles. *Audite qui eſtis longe, qui eſtis prope, nullis celatum eſt verbum, lux communis innoteſcit omnibus, nullus eſt in verbo Cimmerius:* The word is evident, the light ſhineth, there is no darkneſs in the word; *Clem. Alexand. Orat. adhort. ad Gentes.* Whatſoever things are neceſſary are manifeſt in the Scrip-

tures; *Chryſoſt.* Dr. *Prideaux* in the Chair was wont to tell us, that *Scriptura eſt obſcura in aliquibus cognoſcendis a Theologo. Sed non eſt obſcura in credendis & agendis a Chriſtiano:* If the Scriptures be hid they are hid indeed to the Learned Papiſts. How do they write and determine contrary to one another? How plain is *Pighius* in the Point of Juſtification, and the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, as alſo *Gropper* and the *Divines* of *Colen*, and long before them *Aquinas* alſo? How dark and ignorant, and ſhuffling is the Council of *Trent* in that great Point? *Canus* tells us that *Cornelius Mus* the Biſhop of *Bitonto* did affirm in the Council of *Trent*, That *Chriſt in the Supper did not offer Sacrifice: Chriſtum in cœna corpus ſuum & ſanguinem ſuum non obtuliſſe:* Chriſt did not offer up his Body and Blood at the Supper. A moſt undoubted Truth, and that that throws the Maſs with all its attendants upon the face, it gives a deadly blow to almoſt all of Popery; and this *Cornelius* was not alone in this point. But what ſay the Fathers to it? *Canus* tells us, That *jure a Patribus & univerſis Theologis exploſus eſt. Cornelius* and his opinion was juſtly *exploded and caſt out by the Fathers*, and all the Divines in the Council. They decree the contrary, and curſe the gain-ſayer. *Canus* undertaks to confute him, but indeed his Arguments are very watry and childiſh, *Can. in Com. loc. l. 12. c. 12.* There is ſcarce an Article in which they do agree among themſelves, no not in the Point of the Popes Supremacy. Men receive not the Truth in the love of it, and God juſtly lets them wander in the dark and believe a lie; the darkneſs is not in the Sun, but the eye is bleared and dim, the fault is not in the Object but in the faculty; the Scripture is light, but we are dark.

Object. *But they do not prohibit men to read ſo they have a Licenſe.*

Anſ. I told you before that this was a meer flam; and if men might have a Licenſe, yet it is and would be a meer Innovation, and a piece of Tyranny: But it is a very cheat, the Licenſes I have proved already are forbidden by *Paul* the 5. For the further diſcovery of this, let us obſerve what *Clement* the Eighth tells us in his obſervation upon this Decree of the Council; It is to be obſerved (ſaith he) concerning this Rule of *Pius the 4th. That no new power is granted to Biſhops or Inquiſitors to licenſe the buying, reading, or keeping the Bible in the vulgar tongue.* Seeing hitherto by the Commandment and Practice of the holy *Roman* and univerſal Inquiſition, all ſuch power of granting Licenſes hath been taken from them; that whatſoever the Pope and his Crew (ſaith Dr. *White*,) might make a ſhew of to blind the eyes of the World, yet in *very deed they meant no ſuch thing as a Licenſe at all.*

Ledeſiman hath written a Tract about this Queſtion, and he well underſtood their ſenſe; he tells us, *Quamvis aliquis bono animo, &c.* Although (ſaith he) any man with an honeſt mind ſhall deſire a Licenſe, and ſhall pretend that he deſires it for Devotion, and the profit of his Soul: *Si ſe dicat petere bono animo*; yet that of our Saviour may be anſwered to him, *Mat. 19. You ask you know not what, it is a fallacious devotion?*

devotion; a *Zeal, but not according to knowledg*; or rather *it is a ſpirit of diviſion and error at all adventures*; *Concedendum non eſt*; no Licenſe is to be granted. Nay more (and ſomewhat dangerous too) *Radix iſtius petitionis eſt hæreſis*; Hereſie is the riſe and root of ſuch a requeſt; 'tis *hæreſis interior*; therefore they crave a Licenſe to read, becauſe they are ſick of an *inward hereſie*, (*quia hæreſi interiori laborant*,) becauſe they think the thing is neceſſary; and *it ought to be ſo, at leaſt* it is more *expedient, and the contrary* not to be lawful, *Lib. de Lect. S. S. Ling. vern.* So that it ſeems 'tis inward hereſie for a man to deſire leave to read the Bible. 'Tis inward hereſie to think that the Council of *Trent* hath done any thing inexpedient in forbidding people to read under pain of non-abſolution, or the Book-ſeller to ſell under ſuch a Penalty. In the *Taxa Cam. Apoſtol.* a man may buy an Indulgence for Inceſt under 12 *d.* But if a man ſell a Bible it is no leſs mulct than 1200. Duckets. The noble *Morney* ſhall conclude this, *Priſci patres, &c.* the Ancient Fathers did *chide* the People for not reading; the Council doth *curſe* them if they do read. Then, before the Art of Printing, Bibles were ſcarce and dear, now they might have plenty and cheap. They laboured to open the eyes of the People of God; theſe endeavour to put them out, and to keep them in ignorance all their days. And now I pray judg what is become of your Licenſe?

Queſt. the 4th. and laſt. What Deſign have the Papiſts in all this? Why do they thus vilifie, diſparage, prohibit the Scriptures, when their Decrees are ſo manifeſtly repugnant to and confuted by Scriptures, the Old Fathers, and univerſal Practice, and evident Reaſon; ſure they have ſome end that moves them to it.

Anſ. Yes, they have divers. Firſt, They reproach the Scriptures as lame and inſufficient, that they may advance their own Traditions: Traditions are not additions to the Word, ſaith *Canus*, *Quin potius ſunt Verba Divina non aliter ac illa quæ ſacris libris Scripta ſunt: Lib.* 3. *Com. loc. cap. ult.* So *Hoſius*, *Bannes*, *Bellarmine*, *Coſter*, *Alphonſ. a Caſtro*, with all the Herd ſpeak at this rate; and indeed it is time for the Pope to make a new Bible, for the Bible of God is his enemy, and therefore they are enemies to it; *I hate it, for it never ſpeaks good of me.* The Pope muſt beget Traditions, and the Jeſuits to cozen the People muſt name them Apoſtolical.

The Monks of *Hildebrands* breeding were kept back from the Scriptures, to the end that their rude wits might be nouriſhed with the husks of Devils, which are the cuſtomes of humane Traditions, (*Siliquis Dæmoniorum quæ ſunt conſuetudines*,) that being accuſtomed to ſuch filth they might not taſte how ſweet the Lord was. Biſhop *Uſher* out of *Waltram.* Anſw. to *Malone.* *Hildebrand* was a fit tool for ſuch a work, a *Murderer*, a *Poyſoner* of *ſeveral Popes*, a *Necromancer*, *converſed with the Devil*, threw the *Hoſt* into the fire becauſe it would not *anſwer* his demands; as the Oracles were wont to do. See *Bale, Eng. Vot.* This

was

was the man that trampled Scripture, and advanced Traditions: And ſo it came down from hand to hand, from Monks to Friars, from them to Prieſts and Biſhops; hence came the ungodly practice of keeping the Common-People from reading Scriptures, that they might be *drawn to humane Traditions.* Uſher ibid.

The ſecond Reaſon is to maintain their Pride, the Biſhops ſtate, the Prieſts imperiouſneſs, to be accounted ſome great ones; to be called *Rabbi*, and *Magiſter noſter*, they keep away the Scriptures that the People may depend upon them. I fear (ſaith *Eraſmus*) that the People muſt *nihil attingere*, that is in plain *Engliſh*, Be ſots and ſtocks, and brutes. The reaſon and ground of this is not ſo much the danger the People may run into by knowledg, (that is a ſorry but wicked pretence,) *ſed ſui reſpectu*, they keep the People in ignorance (more than *Indians*,) upon their own account; *viz.* that they may be *looked upon as Oracles*, that the People may reſort to them as Oracles, and may ask them what is the meaning of this, or that, and they in a proud Magiſterial way may anſwer, Underſtand thus, (*ſic ſenti, ſic loquere*,) ſpeak thus. To maintain their Pride and Statelineſs they make the People brutes to be led by the noſe, and not Men to be maſters of Reaſon.

The third Reaſon may be this, If the light comes in, the moth-eaten, braided ware will eaſily be diſcovered; therefore you muſt keep the Shop dark, if the People have the Scriptures they will quickly deſert us. Of all men to this purpoſe commend me to *Petrus Sutor*, *Cum multa palam traduntur obſervanda:* Whereas *many thing are openly taught to be obſerved, which are not to be had expreſly in holy Scriptures*, will *not the ſimple people* (*Idiotæ hæc animadvertentes*,) obſerving theſe thing quickly *murmur and complain?* Will they not alſo eaſily be with-drawn from the *Ordinances of the Church when they ſhall find there is no ſuch thing contained in the word of Chriſt?* Pet. Sut. *de Tralat Bibliæ cap.* 22. Indeed here is the nail upon the head; or rather the ſow by the right ear.

Dr. *Harding* gives this as one Reaſon why the People muſt not have the Bible: *ſc.* They will deſpiſe and make the *Simplicity of the Church and of all thoſe things which the Church uſeth as pap and milk to nouriſh her tender Babes withal:* Hard. *Rep. art.* 15. That is, they will deſpiſe that which God would have them deſpiſe; *ſc.* falſe Worſhip. The People by the light of the Scriptures will deſpiſe the antick, mimick poſtures, geſtures, veſtures in their ſuperſtitious idolatrous Worſhip in an unknown Tongue; therefore we will take a courſe, they ſhall not have them: They will ſee and know our Aves and Credo's to be no Prayers, our Ladies Letany, and Prayers to Saints, to be old Paganiſm revived; They will eſpy many a hole in our coat, they will contemn holy Church, and deſpiſe her pap, and we ſhall be made a ſcorn. Indeed here is the finger upon the ſore, down goes *Diana*. In ſhort, Biſhop *Jewel* anſwers *Harding* thus: The People deſpiſe nothing but what ſhould

ſhould be deſpiſed, for they deſpiſe nothing but Superſtition and Idolatry: *ibid.* But theſe are but private Doctors, therefore let us ſee what the Pope himſelf ſaith in the caſe, there is a very conſiderable paſſage to this purpoſe, and I find it quoted by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and Dr. *Moulin.* The Story is this:

The Biſhops meet at *Bononia* to conſult with the then Pope, *Paul* the third, how the Dignity of the *Roman* See might be upheld, for now it began to totter: They offer many ways, at laſt they came to that which they thought the weightieſt of all; and therefore did propoſe laſt which was this: *viz.* That by all means as little of *the Goſpel as poſſible might be, might be read in the Cities* of his Juriſdiction, but eſpecially as *little as poſſible could be in the vulgar Tongue*; and that little that was in the Maſs *ſhould be ſufficient*, and that it ſhould not be permitted to *any mortal man to read more*; for as *long as men were contented with that little, things went well*, but quite otherwiſe ſince more *was commonly* read. For this in ſhort, is that Book (mark that) which *above all others have raiſed theſe tempeſts* and *whirlwinds with which we are almoſt carried away*; and in truth whoſoever diligently conſiders it and compares *it with what is done in our Churches, will find them very contrary* to each other, and our Doctrines not only *to be different* from it, but *repugnant* to it.

A very honeſt, true and ingenuous confeſſion; and indeed it is no hard matter to ſhew to every man, even the meaneſt capacity, how that their Doctrines (not only their Practices) but their very Doctrines are not only different but repugnant to the Sacraments, Lords-Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments: Here, here is the true reaſon for which they do vilifie Scripture, the People are *Lozels*, they might *meddle* with their *Meaſures* and *Diſtaffs*; they will *vent Hereſies, they are not fit*, they will cut their fingers, the holy Father would *ſuffer them to harm themſelves*; he will *chew* their *meat* firſt, and then they ſhall have their pap and milk. Theſe and ſuch like are meer pretences, the true cauſe is rendred by theſe Biſhops here at *Bononia.* This meeting (as I gueſs) was about twenty years after *Luther*, that man of God, (as he is called) began to preach, and ſome years before the Council of *Trent* began, and the Council out-did their advice, for they adviſed as little of the Goſpel to be read as might be, in the vulgar Tongue; but the Council decrees they ſhall have none at all, neither poor nor rich, neither man or woman, neither Prince nor Peaſant, neither Clerk nor Lay-man ſhall read it or have it in the Mother-tongue; as if the fear of *Cain* in ſome ſort were upon them, that whoſoever met them with a Bible ſhould kill them. So much for this.

Now laſtly to the third Point in this Controverſie to be debated; *viz.* That the Scriptures are to be tranſlated into vulgar Tongues, into the Peoples Language; for we have proved already they are to read and hear them, and that therefore they were written by Divine appointment for them, and to them; therefore they ought to be tranſla-

ted.

ted. For what am I the better for the *Indian*-Bible, I know never a word? what would you be the better for a *Welsh* one, unless there be an Interpreter? Methinks the gift of Tongues, *Act.* 2. should convince any one; gifts are for others, for the work of the *Ministry*, that the Body may be *edified*, *Eph.* 4. by the gifts of Tongues did so many Nations; some of *Africa*, some of *Asia*, some of *Europe*, hear the Apostles speak the wonderful things of God in their own Language in which they were born. This was extraordinary as to the attainment, since skill in the Languages hath been attained by ordinary means in the use of study and prayer; and so by Translations People have known by reading, hearing the great Mystery of Jesus, and Salvation by him in their own Tongue; In gifts both ways, extraordinary then, upon a sudden without their study, and gifts ordinary attained by means, since God according to his Infinite Wisdom and Mercy made known his Will, his Grace for mans Salvation. So that I may say of translating the Word, what *Kentigern* a Bishop in *Wales* about the year 550, was wont to say of Preaching; *viz. They that are against Preaching Gods word, envy the Salvation of Mankind.* So they that hinder translating fill Hell.

Ulphilas translated the Bible about thirteen hundred years since into the *Gothish* Tongue; he invented the Characters; translated on purpose that the Barbarous might learn the Mysteries and Truth of God, *Ut discerent eloquia Dei.* Many, very many of the *Goths* were converted, and were Martyred by *Athanaricus*, because they forsook the Religion of their Fathers, *&c.* Paganism, they did embrace death for Christ, *Socr. Eccl. Hist. l.*4. *c.*27.

St. *Hierom* translated the Scriptures into the *Dalmatick* Tongue, *Bellarmine* and *Harding* would seem to doubt of it. *Hosius* and *Alphonsus a Castro* do both acknowledg it; and 'tis no wonder, for *Hierome* himself saith he did so, in his *Epist. ad Sophronium*, *Hominibus linguæ meæ dedi*; and when *Sophronius* desired him to translate the *Psalms* into *Latin* most accurately, because he would translate them into *Greek*, he adviseth him there was no need; and quotes that of the Poet, *In Sylvas ne ligna feras*; that is in *English*, *Carry not coals to Newcastle*, or, *cast not water into the Sea*; there were so many Translations into the *Greek* that it would be supernumerary. Ibid.

The same *Hierom* tells us that at the Burial of *Paula*, such Companies came to the Solemnities out of the Cities of *Palestine* as passed again, and that they did sing Psalms orderly, People of several Nations, *Hebræo*, *Græco*, *Syro*, *Latino Sermone*, in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Syriack*, and *Latin*; *ad Eustoch. de Epitap. Paulæ.*

They that have Translated the *Hebrew* into *Greek*, *Numerari possunt*, may be numbered, they were many; but they that Translated it into *Latin* are numberless, *Latini autem nullo modo*: Austin *de Doct. Christ. lib.*2. *c.*11.

Basil

Basil affirms that Translations were made into the *Palestine*, *Thebane*, *Phœnician*, *Arabick*, and *Lybian* Tongues, *in Epist. ad Neocesar.* *Chrysostome* the same; *Isidore* saith into *all* Christian Tongues, *de Eccles. Offic. cap.* 10.

What should I speak of *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, *Symmachus*, *Origen*, or the *Syriack* of the New Testament, which is very ancient; some ascribe it to *Mark*, for it is so evident that *Alphonsus a Castro* doth confess it, *Fatemur sacros libros olim in linguam vulgarem fuisse translatos*, *We confess that of old time the holy Books were translated into the vulgar tongue.* I humbly conceive it is remarkable (sure I am to me it is so) that God gave to *Jeremy* what the *Jews* should say when they were in *Babylon*, not in the *Hebrew*, but in the *Chaldee* Tongue, for that Tongue the *Babylonians* spoke, and not the *Hebrew*, and so the *Babylonians* might understand what they said to them, *Jer.* 10. 11. *Thus shall ye say unto them, the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, they shall perish, &c.* 'Tis in *Chaldee* there, that is the Original. And so likewise *Daniel* expounds *Nebuchadnezzars* dream to him in the *Chaldee* Tongue, and several Chapters in him are in *Chaldee*; so that here *Chaldee* is the Original. I have mused sometimes why *Daniel* in writing the Historical part of his Book did not write it in *Hebrew*, seeing the things were past and gone before he wrote, why should he historifie those great passages in the *Chaldee* as he spoke them, and not in *Hebrew*, unless it be this, that God would have us from hence observe, That it is his will that men should know their own concerns in their own Tongue, that they themselves might read and hear: What an irrational, bloody, abominable thing then is it in the Council of *Trent* to forbid the Translating of the Scriptures on purpose to keep poor and yet immortal Souls in ignorance; there are none do thus that I know, but the *Turk*, the Grand *Musties* at *Rome* and *Constantinople* in this are agreed. The *Turkish* Religion framed to shed much blood, (*ad fundendum sanguinem facta*) delighteth much in Rites and Ceremonies, and commands belief most imperiously without any *liberty to enquire what or why*: Unde librorum quos sanctos habent lectio plebi interdicta est, *whence it is that the People are forbid to read their (holy) Books, which very thing is a present and manifest token of iniquity.* H. G. de ver. Rel. l. 6.

But let us go a little further in this. *Eusebius* in his *Præp. Evang. l.* 13. inclines to judg that *Moses* was Translated into *Greek* before the *Persian* Monarchy. *Numenius* a *Pythagorean* Philosopher said of *Plato*, that what *Plato* wrote of God and the World, he stole it out of *Moses*, (thus when thieves fall out, *&c.*) and what is *Plato but Moses turned into good Greek?* But whether there were any Translation then, or whether they learned of the *Jews* with whom they did much and long converse, (which is the more probable way of the two.) I mean the prime Philosopher *Pythagoras*, after him nigh 190 years *Plato*, and then *Aristotle* with others, I do not determine; But sure I am (though men love to cry up

theſe and neglect *Moſes*) that they were proud puddling Plagiaries or thieves.

Ptolomy Philadelphus cauſed the *Hebrew* to be tranſlated into *Greek*, and received it with great Veneration when he heard the Law read in a Tongue he underſtood; ſee at large *Joſephus Jew. Antiq. lib.* 12. *c.* 1, 3. other Tranſlations there were that went under the name of the *Septuagint*; this the Eunuch was reading in his Chariot, *Act.* 8. *Luke* ſets it down according as it is in the *Greek* Tranſlation, and not in the *Heb.* Original. *Philip* expounds to him, and God bleſſeth, the Eunuch believes in Jeſus, is baptized, goes on his way rejoycing, a good Argument for Tranſlation; yet that Tranſlation of that Text which the Eunuch was in reading was nothing accurate, *in his humiliation his judgment was taken away*; it is, *he was taken from priſon or reſtraint, and from judgment.* Let us now ſee a little what our Adverſaries do object againſt us in this caſe. Firſt they ſay,

Obj. *This Iſland hath continued in the Faith this* 1300 *years without Bibles till of late.*

Anſ. Very falſe, *Conſtantine* commanded the Bible to be written and ſent abroad into all Countrys, Kingdoms, Nations of his Dominions; whereof *England*, or rather *Britain* was one. *Adelſtane* King of *England* cauſed the Bible to be Tranſlated into the *Engliſh* Tongue. *Beda* almoſt a thouſand years ſince Tranſlated the Goſpel of St. *John* into *Engliſh*. Biſhop *Jewel*, *John Treviſa*, *Fuller*, *C. H. Beda* ſaith, *Five Nations did converſe with one Truth, one Bible, Britons, Engliſh, Picts, Scots, Latins. Hæc Inſula quinque gentium linguis unam eandemque ſcrutatur veritatis ſcientiam*, Bed. lib. 1. Eccleſ. Hiſt. *Cedman* Tranſlated the Hiſtory of the Creation, the Departure from *Egypt*, the Entrance into *Canaan*, the Birth, Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Chriſt, the Glory of Heaven, the Pains of Hell: *De Doctrina Apoſtolorum, de terrore futuri Judicii, de aliis plurimis Scripturæ Hiſtoriis; multorum animi ad contemptum ſæculi & ad appetitum vitæ cæleſtis accenſi fuere*, Bed. *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* (according to mine,) *lib.* 4. *c.* 24. many men were mortified and made heavenly thereby, by *Cedmans* Tranſlation. Suppoſe they had none, what then, ſhould they never have? time was they were Gentiles and Pagans, ſhould they continue ſo?

Obj. 2. *Your Tranſlations are faulty*, Harding, Rhemiſts.

Anſw. This is ſaid a thouſand times but never proved, an untruth joyned with ſlander, ſo *Jewel*; a ſpiteful lie, ſo *Cartwright* anſwers the Jeſuits; Shew them (ſaith he), Dr. *Martin* did attempt it, but was laught at for his folly by his friend: The words may be ſhort, but the ſenſe is incorrupt.

Obj. 3. *What, the Scripture Tranſlated into a Barbarous Tongue!*

Anſ. This makes a noiſe, Barbarous, barbarous, Vulgar Tongues, for Hoſtlers, Tapſters, Sempſters, idle, looſe, ſenſual, brutal men, this is their Rhetorick; but indeed it is a very rancorous, croaking noiſe;

Barbara

Barbara lingua eſt quæ neſcit laudare Dominum, Bed. The Bible in any Language is holy, and the Language is holy that knows how to worſhip God, and bleſs Jeſus. What were the *Canaanites*? what was *Terah*, *Nahor*, *Abraham*, before God called him? When *Abraham* came into *Canaan* was not the *Hebrew* the Language of Heathens? was not the *Greek* a Pagan Tongue? *If I know not the meaning of the voice I ſhall be a Barbarian to him, and he to me*, 1 Cor. 14. 11. *Paul* calls every Tongue barbarous that is not underſtood, and ſo all the Prayers of the Papiſts are barbarous, becauſe they are not underſtood by the People.

To conclude, they allow no Tranſlation but the old *Latin*, this the Council makes authentical, prefers above the Original; it hath been mended ſeveral times, but yet crawls with many very great faults, againſt their knowledg on purpoſe to defend their Errors and Idolatries. I refer to *Chemnit. Exam. 1 part. de Scr.* Our learned Biſhop *Mortons* Appeal, *Lib.* 4. *c.* 18. *Sect.* 3. there it may be found.

Take an Inſtance or two in *Gen.* 3. 15. *He ſhall bruiſe the Serpents head*; ſo the *Hebrew*, ſo the Seventy Tranſlate it. So the learned Papiſts do acknowledg it. Yet in the laſt Edition ſet forth by *Clement* the Eighth, the vulgar *Latin* read it, *She*; *ſc.* the Virgin *Mary*, *She ſhall break the Serpents head.* And this though it be a manifeſt, nay a confeſſed corruption of the Text, yet is ſtill reſerved by them, and no man in Writing, Preaching, Diſputing, muſt dare to uſe any other but this, and this they do againſt knowledg, on purpoſe to keep up their blaſphemous, Idolatrous Worſhip: Here is their Reformation.

So in *Exod.* 34. 29, 30. they read thus, *They ſaw his face horned*: Heb. *ſhining*, as we read it; hereupon they picture *Moſes* with a pair of Horns, for which the *Jews* do horribly curſe the Chriſtians, as though they thought *Moſes* to be a Devil.

So *Heb.* 11. 21. they read it, *Jacob worſhipped the top of his rod*; *adoravit faſtigium virgæ*; whereas in the *Greek* it is, *He worſhipped upon his ſtaff, at or upon his ſtaff.* And this is confeſſed by their own men, *Græce ſuper faſtigium*; *ſc. nixus baculo ejus*; Sa. Jeſ. *in loc.* Though our Tranſlators dealt honeſtly, putting *leaning* in a different Character, becauſe it is not in the *Greek*. How do they cry out of Fallities! no man can think what a ſtir the Image-mongers make for their Idolatry by this corrupt Tranſlation of their Vulgar, that *Jacob worſhipped his ſtaff*; they catch at any ſorry thing for advantage. So in their own Annotations upon *Mat.* 2. the Wiſemen that came from the Eaſt, they impudently and fooliſhly call them the *three Kings of Colen*; and how their Bodies were tranſlated thither on purpoſe to keep the old trade of Pilgrimage and Prayers for the ſake of Offerings; they durſt not let the Bible go abroad without a keeper, their frothy fooliſh falſe Notes.

Well, let us ſeriouſly conſider what a rich mercy we have that we have it in liberty, purity, ſafety in our Mother-tongue. How do *Hierom*, *Auſtin*, and the reſt of the Fathers, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and our own Re-

formers ſtrain for Expreſſions to ſet forth their Excellency, let us not be dull and ſtupid; let us abhor Popery that will maintain their Kingdom of Darkneſs, though it be in darkneſs of *Souls*, the ready way to *everlaſting* darkneſs.

Let us pray frequently for the life and ſafety of him that is Supream, and thoſe that are ſubordinate under him; Aſſure your ſelves theſe are matters of near concernment.

Let us pray that God would blaſt Popery, that God would preſerve us from it; if that ſhould for our Goſpel-ſins prevail, you muſt loſe your Bibles, perhaps your Bodies too, unleſs you will adventure to loſe the Truth, and your Souls: aſſure your ſelves they have waded through the blood of men to deſtroy the Word of God, and will do ſo ſtill; their ſtrongeſt arguments are Swords and Stakes.

Laſtly, by Hearing, Reading, Praying, Meditation, let every one of us labour to be expert in the Word, *Apollos* was mighty in the Scriptures. To ſtir up your hearts, conſider theſe Particulars: 1. The Author; it is infinitely the beſt, the moſt holy, only wiſe God; 1 *Tim.* 3. v. *laſt.* 2 *Pet.* 1. v. *laſt.* it is ſeven times repeated in the ſeven Epiſtles, *Rev.* 2. 3. *ch.* what the Spirit, the Spirit of Glory, of Holineſs, the Spirit of Truth ſaith to the Churches. 2. The matter; it is our Lord Jeſus: here are the treaſures, all treaſures, of Wiſdom, Divine Wiſdom and Knowledg; here are the Commands of God, full, plain, pure, everlaſting; here are the Promiſes exceeding great, free, precious Promiſes, Yea and Amen in Chriſt; here are the Works of Gods Creation and Providence, which the Philoſophers knew not. 3. The Office of it, it is to inſtruct, to give underſtanding, to convince of Sin, of Hell, of Jeſus, 'tis to breed and encreaſe Holineſs, Peace of Conſcience. Laſtly the end, to make us wiſe unto Salvation, through Faith in Chriſt Jeſus.

SERMON

SERMON VI.

PROPOSITION.

The Scripture is a ſufficient Rule of Chriſtian Faith, or a Record of all neceſſary Chriſtian Doctrines, without any ſupplement of unwritten Traditions, as containing any neceſſary matter of Faith, and is thus far ſufficient for the deciſion of all Controverſies.

2 Theſ. 2. 15. *Therefore Brethren ſtand faſt and hold the Traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epiſtle.*

THe Apoſtle after he had *comforted* the *Theſſalonians*, he *exhorteth* them to Conſtancy in the Truth, whatever Temptations they had to the contrary. The *Comforts* he propoundeth to them were taken, 1. From their *Election*, ver. 13. 2*ly*. From their *Vocation*, ver. 14. His *Exhortation* is to Perſeverance: *Therefore, Brethren, &c.*

In the words obſerve, 1. The Illative particle [*Therefore*] becauſe God hath *choſen* you and *called* you, and given you ſuch advantages againſt Error and Seduction.

2. The Duty inferred, στήκετε, *ſtand faſt*; it is a Military word, you have the ſame in other places, 1 *Cor.* 16. 13. *Watch ye, ſtand ye faſt, &c.* *Epheſ.* 6. 14. *Stand therefore, having your loyns girt about with truth.* The word intimateth Perſeverance.

3. The

3. The means of Perſeverance, *Hold the Traditions which you have been taught, whether by word or our Epiſtle.*

Where obſerve, 1. The *Act*; 2. The *Object.*

1. The *Act*, κρατεῖτε, *hold* with ſtrong hand; the word implieth a forcible holding againſt aſſaults, whether of *Error* or *Perſecution.* The *Theſſalonians* were aſſaulted in both kinds; the Heathens perſecuted them, and ſome were gone abroad that began the *Myſtery of Iniquity*, and were ready to pervert them.

2. The *Object*; which is propounded, 1. By a common and general term, the *Traditions which you have been taught.* 2. By a Diſtribution, *Whether by word or our* Epiſtle.

I. The common and general term, [*the Traditions which ye have been taught,*] there are two ſorts of Traditions, *Humane* and *Divine.*

1. Humane Traditions are certain External Obſervances inſtituted by men, and delivered from hand to hand, from Progenitours to their Poſterity; theſe may be either *beſides* or *contrary* to the Word of God: 1. *Beſide* the Word; as the Inſtitutions of the Family of the *Rechabites*, in the obſervance of which from Father to Son, they were ſo exact and punctual, that God produceth their Example to ſhame the diſobedience of his People, *Jer.* 35. 6,7. *Jonadab the Son of Rechab our Father commanded us ſaying, Ye ſhall drink no wine, nor build houſes, nor plant Vineyards, &c.* 2. *Contrary* to the Word of God; ſuch as were thoſe of the Phariſees, *Mat.*15.2. *Why tranſgreſs ye the Commandment of God by your Tradition?* Humane inventions in Religion are contrary to and deſtructive of Divine Laws.

2. *Traditions Divine* are either Heavenly Doctrins revealed by God, or Inſtitutions and Ordinances appointed by him for the uſe of the Church. Theſe are the Rule and Ground of our *Faith*, *Worſhip* and *Obedience.* The whole Doctrine of the Goſpel is a *Tradition* delivered and conveyed to us by fit Meſſengers, ſuch as the Apoſtles were; 1 *Cor.* 11. 2. *Now I praiſe you Brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances*, Marg. *Traditions, as I delivered them to you.* So that *holding the Traditions* is nothing elſe but Perſeverance in Apoſtolical Doctrine.

II. The *Diſtribution*; That no cheats might be put upon them under any pretence; therefore, he ſaith, *Whether by word, or our Epiſtle*; that is, by *word of mouth* when preſent, or *by Epiſtle* when abſent. And he ſaith, not *Epiſtles*, but *Epiſtle*; asalluding to the former wrote unto them: They were bound to yield toboth alike credence and obedience; for whether in *ſpeaking* or *writing*, the Apoſtolical Authority was the ſame. To improve this Verſe for your benefit, I ſhall lay down ſeveral Propoſitions.

1. *That whatever aſſurance we have of Gods preſerving us in the truth, yet we are bound to uſe diligence and caution*; for the Apoſtle had ſaid, That God had *choſen* and *called* them to the *belief of the truth*; and yet ſaith, *Therefore Brethren ſtand faſt.* Firſt, Reaſon will tell us. That when we intend

intend *an End* we must use *the Means*, otherwise the *bare intention* and desire would suffice, and to the accomplishing of any effect, we need no more than to will it; and then the sluggard would be the wisest man in the world; who is full of Wishings and Wouldings, though his hands refuse to labour; But common experience sheweth that the End cannot be obtained without a diligent use of the means, *Prov.* 13.4. *The soul of the sluggard desireth and hath nothing, but the soul of the diligent shall be made fat*; that is, rewarded with the intended benefit.

2. The business in hand is, Whether Gods Election, Calling, or Promise doth so secure the End to us, as that we need not be so careful in the diligent use of Means. Such a notion or conceit there may be in the hearts of men, therefore let us attack it a little by these Considerations.

1. Gods Decree is both of *Ends* and *Means*; for all his Purposes are executed by fit means. He that *hath chosen us to Salvation*, bringeth it about by the *belief of the Truth and Sanctification of the Spirit*, 2 Thes. 2. 13. And without Faith and Holiness no man shall see God, and escape condemnation. God had assured *Paul*, *That there should be no loss of any mans life among them except of the Ship*, Act. 27. 22. And yet afterward *vers.* 31. *Paul* telleth them, *Except these abide in the Ship ye cannot be saved.* How could that Assurance given to *Paul* from God, and *Pauls* Caution to the Mariners stand together? Doth the purpose of God depend upon the uncertain will and actions of men? I answer not as *a cause*, from whence it receiveth its force and strength, but as *a means* appointed also by God to the execution of his Decree; for by the same Decree God appointeth the event what he will do, and the means by which he will have it to be done; and the Lord revealing by his Word this conjunction of Ends and Means, there is a necessity of Duty lying upon man to use these Means and not to expect the End without them. God intended to save all in the Ship, and yet the Mariners must abide in the Ship; therefore what God hath joined together let no man separate: If we separate these things God doth not change his Counsel, but we pervert his order to our own destruction.

2*ly*. God that hath bidden us to *believe his Promises*, hath forbidden us to *tempt his Providence*, Mat. 4. 7. Now we *tempt God*, when we desire him to give an extraordinary proof of his care over us, when ordinary Means will serve the turn, or be useful to us.

3*ly*. Though the Means seem to have no connexion with the End; yet if God hath injoined them for that End, we must use them. As in the instance of *Naaman*, God was resolved to cure him; but *Naaman* must take his prescribed way, though against his own fancy and conceit, 2 *King.* 5. 10. *Wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again unto thee, and thou shalt be clean.* Compare *vers.* 13. *If the Prophet had bidden thee to do some greater thing, &c.* So *Joh.* 13. 6, 7. *Peter* must submit to be *washed*, though he could not see the *benefit* of it. So

Johs.

Joh. 9. 6, 7. the blind man muſt ſubmit to have his *eyes anointed with clay*, and *waſh in the Pool of Siloam*; though the Clay ſeemed to put out his eyes rather than cure them; and the Pool could not waſh away his blindneſs; but Means appointed by God muſt be uſed, whatever improbabilities are apprehended by us.

4. That when Gods Will is expreſly declared concerning the Event, yet he will have the Means uſed; as for inſtance, 2 *King.* 20. 5, 6, 7. God was abſolutely reſolved to add *fifteen years* more to *Hezekiahs* life, yet he muſt take a *lump of Figs and lay it on the boil:* Which plainly ſheweth that no *promiſe* on Gods part, nor *aſſurance* on ours hindreth the uſe of Means, God will work by them, not without them.

5. In Spiritual things Aſſurance of the Event is an *encouragement to induſtry*, not a *pretence to ſloth*, 1 Joh. 2. 27, 28. *Tea ſhall abide in him*; and now, *Little children abide in him.* The promiſe of Perſeverance doth incourage us to uſe endeavours that we may perſevere, and *quicken diligence* rather than *nouriſh ſecurity*, or open a gap to *carnal liberty*, 1 Cor. 9. 26. *I run not as one that is uncertain*; we are the more earneſt, becauſe we are aſſured the Means ſhall not be uneffectual.

2. Prop: *Our duty is to ſtand faſt in the Faith of Chriſt, and profeſſion of Godlineſs, whatever Temptations we have to the contrary.* [Stand faſt] being a Military word, it alludeth to a Soldiers keeping his ground; and is oppoſed to two things, 1. *A cowardly flight*; 2. *A treacherous revolt.*

1. *A cowardly flight*, implieth our being overcome in *the evil-day*, by the many afflictions that befal us for the Truths ſake, *Epheſ.* 6. 13. *Wherefore take to you the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withſtand in the evil-day, that after you have done all things ye may ſtand.* Their Temptation was the many troubles and perſecutions that befal them, called there *the evil day.* Their defence lay in the *whole armor of God*, which is there made of ſix pieces, *the Girdle of Truth* or *Sincerity*, which is a ſtrength to us as a girdle to the loyns; the *breaſt-plate of Righteouſneſs*, or an holy inclination and deſire to perform our Duty to God in all things; and the *Shield of Faith*, or a ſtedfaſt adhering to the Truths of the Goſpel, whether delivered in a way of command, promiſe or threatning; the *Helmet of Hope*, or a certain and delirous expectation of the promiſed Glory, *the ſhoo of the preparation of the Goſpel of peace*, which is a headineſs to endure all Encounters for Chriſts ſake, who hath made our Peace with God; and the *Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God*: Now if we take this armor and uſe it in our Conflicts, what doth it ſerve for? to *withſtand* and *ſtand*; the firſt is the act of *a Soldier*, the ſecond is the poſture of a *Conqueror*; here is *withſtanding* till the Field be won, and then *ſtanding* when the day of evil is over. Here we make our way to heaven by conflict and conqueſt, and hereafter we triumph.

2. *A*

2. *A treacherous revolt*, or yielding to the enemy by complying with thoſe things which are againſt the Intereſt of Chriſt and his Kingdom, for advantage ſake, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. *Demas hath forſaken us and loved the preſent world.* Backſliders *in heart* are the worſt ſort of Apoſtates, ſuch as loſe their affection to God, and delight in his ways, and eſteem of his glorious recompences, for a little pleaſure, profit, or pomp of living; *Sell the birth-right for one morſel of meat*, Heb. 12. 15, 16. Some fail in their *underſtandings*, but moſt miſcarry by the perverſe inclination of their *wills*; they are carnal, worldly Hypocrites that never thoroughly mortified the fleſhly mind; prize things as they are commodious to the fleſh, and will ſave them from ſufferings. The byaſs of ſuch mens hearts doth eaſily prevail againſt the light of their underſtandings.

3. Prop. *The means of ſtanding faſt is by holding the Traditions which were taught by the holy Apoſtles.* Here I will prove, 1. That the Doctrine of Chriſtianity taught by the Apoſtles is a Tradition. 2. That holding this Tradition by ſtrong hand, when others *would* wreſt it from us, is the means of our Perſeverance.

1. *That the Doctrine of Chriſtianity is a Tradition.* I prove it by two Arguments; firſt, Matters not evident by the *light of nature*, nor immediately revealed to us by God muſt be either *an Invention* or *a Tradition*; an *Invention* is ſomething in Religion not evident by natural light, nor agreeable to ſound reaſon, but is ſome cunningly *deviſed fable*, invented by one or more, and obtruded by various artifices upon the Belief of the World. Inventions in this kind were mans *diſeaſe*, not his *remedy*, *Eccleſ.* 7. 29. *God made man upright but they ſought out many Inventions.* As when the Philoſophers ſat abrood upon Religion, a goodly *Chymæra* it was they hatched and brought forth! *Rom.* 1. 21, 22. *They became vain in their imaginations, and their fooliſh heart was darkened, and profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe they became fools.* Theſe Inventions little became *the nature of God.* Nor were they *profitable to man*, for ſtill the great ſore of nature was unhealed which is a *fear of death*, and the righteous wrath of God, *Rom.* 1. 32. ſo that neither mans *comfort* nor *duty* was well provided for: ſurely the Goſpel is none of this ſort; not an *Invention of man*, but a *Revelation of God*; and a Revelation not made to *us in perſon*, but brought out of *the boſom of God* by Jeſus Chriſt, and by him manifeſted to choſen witneſſes, who might publiſh this Myſtery and Secret to others. Well then, ſince the Goſpel is not an *Invention*, it is a *Tradition*, or a delivery of the Truth upon the Teſtimony of one that came from God to inſtruct the World, or reduce it to him; not an Invention of man, but a Secret brought out of the boſom of God, by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: Therefore 'tis ſaid, *Heb.* 2, 3, 4. *How ſhall we eſcape if we neglect ſo great Salvation; firſt ſpoken by the Lord himſelf, and then confirmed to us by them that heard him, the Lord bearing*

them witneſs, &c. Chriſt delivered it to the Apoſtles, and the Apoſtles delivered it to others, 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. *Thoſe things which thou haſt heard from me among many witneſſes, the ſame commit thou to faithful men, who ſhall be able to teach others alſo.* The Apoſtles received the Goſpel from Chriſt, and the Churches, and Miniſters from the Apoſtles, and then delivered it down to others until it came to us; which is the means of our believing the Truth, and confeſſing the Name of Chriſt. This Teſtimony delivered and conveyed to us by the moſt credible Means, and which we have no reaſon to doubt of, is as binding as if we had heard Chriſt and his Apoſtles in perſon: for we have their *word* in *writing*, though we did not hear them preach and publiſh it with the lively voice; their Authority is the ſame delivered either way. And that theſe are their Writings, appeareth by the *conſtant Tradition* of the Church, and the acknowledgment of *Friends* and *Enemies*, who ſtill appeal to them as a *publick authentick Record*, and as they have been atteſted *by the Church*, they have been owned *by God*, and bleſſed by him to the converting and ſanctifying of many Souls, throughout all ſucceſſions of Ages: And by this Tradition Chriſtianity hath held up the head againſt all encounters of time, and the *perſecutions* of adverſe Powers have not ſuppreſſed it; nor the diſputes of enemies ſilenced the profeſſion of it: But from age to age it hath been received and tranſmitted to future Generations, though ſometimes at a very dear rate. And this is binding to us though we ſaw not the Perſons and Miracles by which they confirmed their Meſſage, and heard not the firſt report. Yet the *Univerſal Tradition* having handed it to us is a ſufficient ground of Faith; and ſo *we believe through their word*, and are concerned in Chriſts Prayers, *Joh.* 17. 20. for with them and their Succeſſors (as to theſe neceſſary things) Chriſt hath promiſed to be to the *end of the world*, Mat. 28. 20.

2*ly.* My next Argument is; Becauſe Chriſtian Religion muſt needs be a Tradition, partly becauſe *matter of fact* is the foundation of it, and it is in it ſelf *matter of faith*: 1. Becauſe it is built upon *matter of fact*, that the Son of God came from God to bring us to God; that is to ſay, appeared in *Humane nature*, inſtructed the World by his *Doctrine* and *Example*, and at length *died for ſinners*, confirming both in *life* and *death* the truth of *his Miſſion*, by ſuch unqueſtionable Miracles as ſhewed him to be the *Son of God*, and the *Saviour of the World*. Now a Teſtimony, Tradition, or Report is neceſſary in *matters of fact*, which of neceſſity muſt be confined to ſome determinate *time* and *place*. It was not fit that Chriſt ſhould be always working Miracles, always dying, always riſing and aſcending, in every place, and in the view of every man; but theſe things were to be once done in one place of the World, in the ſight of ſome particular and competent Witneſſes: But becauſe the knowledg of them concerned all the reſt of the World, they were by them to be atteſted to others; *matters of fact* can only be proved

ved by *credible witneſſes*, and this was the great Office put upon the Apoſtles, *Act.* 1. 8. 21, 22. and *Act.* 2. 32. *Act.* 3. 15. *Act.* 10. 39, 40, 41. 2. As it is *matter of Fact*; or the Doctrine built upon this *matter of Fact*. We cannot properly be ſaid to believe a thing but upon report and teſtimony: I may *know* a thing by *ſenſe* or *reaſon*, but I cannot *believe* it but as it is affirmed or brought to me by credible Teſtimony. As we are ſaid *to ſee* thoſe things which we perceive by the eye, or the ſenſe of ſeeing, and to *know* thoſe things which we receive by *reaſon*, or *ſure demonſtration*; ſo we are ſaid to *believe* thoſe things which are brought to us by *valuable teſtimony*, *tradition*, and *report*. As for inſtance if any one ask you, Do you believe the Sun ſhineth at Noonday? You will anſwer, I do not *believe* it but *ſee* it: So if any one ask you, Do you believe that twice two make four, and twice three make ſix? You will ſay I do not *believe* it but *know* it, becauſe certain and evident reaſon telleth me, that two is the half of four, and three of ſix, and every whole conſiſteth of two halfs or moyeties: But if he ſhould ask you, Do you believe that the Sun is bigger than the Earth? You will ſay *I believe it*; for though your Eye doth not diſcover it, nor doth an ignorant man know any certain demonſtration of it; yet having the authority of learned men, who are competent judges in the caſe, you judg it a raſh and fooliſh obſtinacy not to believe it. Apply it now to *the myſteries of Godlineſs* revealed in the Goſpel, they cannot be ſeen with the Eye, for they are inviſible; nor found out and comprehended by any Humane Underſtanding, becauſe they exceed the reach of mans Reaſon, and depend upon *the love* and arbitrary will of God, *Joh.* 3. 16. Yet you believe them, becauſe God hath revealed them to the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*; and God being Truth and Wiſdom it ſelf, cannot deceive, or be deceived; and therefore you believe them with the certainty of Divine Faith, and do no more doubt of them than you do of thoſe things which you ſee with your eyes, and know and underſtand by a ſure Demonſtration. The ſenſe of ſeeing may be deceived, and Humane Reaſon may err; but 'tis impoſſible God ſhould deceive or be deceived. It often-times falleth out that men do preſer the authority and report of a man whom they judg to be wiſe and good before their own ſenſe and reaſon; as for inſtance, that man who by his eye judgeth the Sun to be leſs than the Earth, yet doth not obſtinately ſtand in his opinion, when he heareth a knowing and skilful Philoſopher aſſert the contrary; *Now if we receive the witneſs of men the witneſs of God is greater*, 1 Joh. 5. 9. And this Teſtimony of God is brought to us by his authorized Meſſengers as the *ground of Faith*; and what is that but Tradition. We believe in God by hearing of him, and we *hear by a Preacher*, Rom. 10. 14. Ordinary Preachers *declare* his mind to us, but the Extraordinary *confirm* it; the common Preachers give us *notice*, but *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* give us *aſſurance*; and by their Teſtimony and Tradition our Faith is *ultimately reſolved* into the *Veracity* of God.

2*ly.* That holding this Tradition is the great means of ſtanding faſt in the Faith of Chriſt, and the Confeſſion of his Name. For in the Word of God delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, there *is ſure direction* to walk by; *and ſure promiſes* to build upon. For whatever they made known of Chriſt was *not a fable*, but a *certain truth*; for they had the teſtimony of Senſe, 2 *Pet.* 1. 16, 17. 1 *Joh.* 1. 1, 2, 3, 4. and ſo could plead both the *authority of his command*, and *the certainty of his Promiſe*, and that with *uncontroulable evidence*; and without this Revelation there can be neither *Faith* nor *Obedience*, nor *ſure expectation* of Happineſs. For we cannot *truſt* God for what he hath not promiſed, nor *obey* God in what he hath not commanded; nor in our difficulties and diſtreſſes *expect* happineſs from him without his warrant and aſſurance. But by this Doctrine delivered to us we have all that belongeth to *Faith*, *Obedience* and *Happineſs*; and beyond that the Creature can deſire no more. 1. There can be no Faith till we have a ſure Teſtimony of Gods Revelation; for *Faith is a believing ſuch things as God hath revealed, becauſe he hath revealed them.* 'Tis not *Faith* but *fancy*, to believe ſuch things as God hath never revealed; nor is it *Truſt* and a *regular Confidence* to think, that he will certainly give us what he hath never promiſed; this were to lay us open to all manner of deluſion: And therefore we are never upon ſure and ſtable ground, but by ſticking to *ſuch a Tradition* as may juſtly intitle it ſelf to God. 2. Nor *Obedience*; for Obedience is a *doing what God hath commanded becauſe he hath commanded it.* The fundamental reaſon of Obedience is the ſight *of Gods will*, 1 Theſ. 4. 3. 1 *Theſ.* 5. 18. 1 *Pet.* 2. 15. To do what God never commanded, or not to do it upon that account but for other reaſons is not Obedience; and in difficult caſes the Soul can never be held to its duty, till we are perſwaded that ſo is Gods Will concerning us. Now to know his Will concerning us, we are often bidden *to ſearch the Scriptures*; but never bidden to conſult with the Church to know what *unwritten Traditions* ſhe hath in her keeping to inſtruct us in our Duty. 3. No *certain expectation of Happineſs.* We are never ſafe till we know by what Rule Chriſt will *judg us*, that is, *reward* or *puniſh* men at the laſt day: Now he will judg us according to the Goſpel; *Rom.* 2. 16. 1 *Theſ.* 1. 8. Obey the Goſpel, and you have a perfect Rule to guide you to Happineſs; but if you neglect *this great Salvation*, or be unfaithful in the profeſſion of it, this Word condemneth you, and God will ratifie the ſentence of it.

4. Prop. *That whileſt the Apoſtles were in being, there were two ways of delivering the Truth, and that is by word of mouth and writing.* So in the Text, *Whether by word, or our Epiſtle.* The Apoſtles went up and down and preached Chriſt every-where; that needeth no proof, unleſs you would have me to produce the whole Book of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*: But they did not *preach* only but *write*, and both by the inſtinct of the

the holy Spirit, who guided their *Journies*, and moved them to *write Epiſtles*: For being often abſent from Churches newly planted, and Hereſies ariſing, or ſome Contentions, which could not be avoided among weak Chriſtians, God over-ruled theſe *Occaſions* for the profit of the Church in after-Ages. Upon one occaſion or another they ſaw a neceſſity to write ἀνάγκην ἔσχον, *Jude* 3. *It was needful for me to write unto you.* As in the Old Teſtament God himſelf delivered the *Law* with great Majeſty and terrour, and afterward cauſed the ſame to be written in Tables of Stone for the conſtant uſe of his People. And the Prophets firſt *uttered* their Prophecies, and then *wrote* them: So the Apoſtles firſt *preached* Evangelical Doctrine, and then conſigned it to *writing* for the uſe of all Ages. And though all things delivered by them were not delivered in *one Sermon*, or *one Epiſtle*, yet by degrees the Canon of the New Teſtament was conſtituted and made perfect by the Writings of the *Evangeliſts* and *Apoſtles*.

5. Prop: *That now when they are long ſince gone to God, and we cannot receive from them the Doctrine of Life by word of mouth, we muſt ſtick to the Scriptures or written word.* 1. Becauſe we are taught to do ſo by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*. Chriſt always appealeth to the Writings of the Old Teſtament, both againſt *Traditions*, which he condemneth, *Mat.* 15. 2. and againſt *pretended Revelations*, Luk. 16. 31. *If they hear not Moſes and the Prophets, neither will they be perſwaded to repent, if one ſhould come from the dead.* And the Apoſtles ſtill have recourſe to this proof, *Act.* 26. 22. *Witneſſing no other things than the Prophets and Moſes did ſay ſhould come to paſs:* And when they pleaded they were eye and ear-witneſſes, and ſo their Teſtimony was valuable; yet they ſay ye have βεβαιότερον λόγον, *a ſurer word of Propheſie whereunto ye ſhall do well to take heed*, 2 Pet. 1. 19. Now how can we do better than to imitate theſe great Examples? 2. Becauſe theſe things were written for our ſakes, 1 *Joh.* 1. 4. *Theſe things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.* The Apoſtles being to leave the World, did know the *ſlipperineſs* of mans memory, and the danger of *corrupting* Chriſtian Doctrine, if there were not a ſure Authentick Record left; Therefore they wrote, and ſo fully, that nothing is wanting to compleat our joy and happineſs. 3. Becauſe the Scriptures *are perfect*. The perfection of Scripture is known by *its end*, and intended *uſe*, which is to give us a knowledg of thoſe things which concern our *Faith*, *Duty* and *Happineſs*. 1. Our *Faith in Chriſt*. If there be enough written for that end, we need not unwritten Traditions to compleat our Rule: Now St. *John* telleth us he might have written more things, *But theſe things are written that ye might believe in the Son of God, and have life through his name*, Joh. 20. 30, 31. Certainly nothing is wanting to beget a Faith in Chriſt; the *Object* is ſufficiently propounded, the *Warrant* or *Claim* is laid down in the New Covenant, and the *Incouragements* to believe are *clear* and

ſtrong.

strong. What would men have more? so that here is a perfect Rule, perfect in *its kind*, and for its *proper use*. 2. For our Duty; that is sufficiently provided for. The Apostle telleth us, That *the Grace of God*, take it *Objectively* for the Grace of the Gospel, or *Subjectively* for Grace in our hearts, *teacheth us*: if you mean *Objective Grace*, it *prescribeth, directeth*; if of *Subjective Grace*, it perswadeth and exciteth what to do, *to live soberly, righteously, godly, in the present world*, Tit. 2. 12. There are all the Branches of Mans Duty enumerated: *Sobriety* relateth to self-government; *Righteously* to our carriage towards our Neighbour; *Godly* to our commerce and communion with God. Now in the Word of God what is there wanting, that belongeth either to Worship, or Justice, or personal Holiness? therefore certainly we need no other Rule; for it layeth down whatsoever Men are bound to do in all Ages and Places of the World, and in whatsoever circumstances God shall put them: And so it is fit to be the Law of the *Universal King* and *Lawgiver*; yea it is so perfect, that whatever other way is set up, it presently dasheth against those notions that we have or should have of God and his Service, and Worship; or it *infringeth* or *perverteth* the *liberty* and *nature* of man. 3. For our Happiness; that Doctrine and Institution, which is able to make us *wise unto Salvation*, is enough for us, but so the holy Scriptures are said to do, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Thou hast known the holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto Salvation, through the faith which is in Christ Jesus.* Nay afterward, *vers.* 17. *The man of God is by them made perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good work.*

If the Scriptures do thoroughly direct Men to know God in Christ, and save their own Souls, why should we look any further? Now they do not only furnish every private Christian with this knowledg; but the *man of God*, who is to instruct others, he needeth look no further, but is furnished out of the Scripture with all things necessary to discharge his Office. Therefore here we fix and rest, we have a sufficient Rule, and a full Record of all necessary Christian Doctrines.

Use 1. The Use of all is; Let us not seek another Rule than the Word of God. Papists cry up Unwritten Traditions to be received with *equal respect* and *reverence*, as we receive the holy Scriptures; but you Brethren, *stand fast*, holding the Apostolical Tradition: you cannot have it by word of mouth from them now; therefore you must stick to what is written, or else you cannot preserve your selves from the frauds and impostures of Antichrist. These Apostolical Writings have been received in all ages and times of the Church from the beginning; and *all Disputes* among Christians have been tried by them: None were allowed good or sincere Christians who doubted of the truth of them. But because we have to do with a People that will sacrifice all to the honour and interest of their Church; and knowing they are not able to stand before the light of Scriptures, have to the no little preju-

dice

dice of the Christian Cause done all that they can to weaken the *Authority*, *Sufficiency* and *Perspicuity* of them, that we might have no Religion without the Testimony and Recommendation of their Church; therefore I shall resume the matter and declare it afresh.

1. Mankind lying in darkness, and in the shadow of death, it was necessary that one way or another God should reveal his mind to them, that we may know what belongeth to our *Duty* and *Happiness*, for our *chief good* and *last end*. Being altered by sin, we strangely mistake things, and put *light* for *darkness*, and *darkness* for *light*, *good* for *evil*, and *evil* for *good*; weighing all things in the ballance of the flesh which we seek to please. We confound both the *names* and *natures* of things, and wander in a maze of a thousand perplexities; therefore God in pity to Mankind hath given us a sure direction in his Word, *which is a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our paths*, Psal. 119. 105. Mark the words of *Light* and *Lamp*; the use of a *Lamp* is by night, and in the day we have the *Light* of the Sun; whether it be *day* or *night* with us, here we are taught how to carry our selves. Mark again the words of *Path* and *Feet*, the one signifieth our *way* and general course, the other all our *particular actions*, so far as Religion is concerned in them, we have directions in the Word about them. Besides Mans condition is such that he needeth a *Supernatural Remedy* by a Redeemer, which depending upon the meer Love and free Grace of God cannot be found out by *Natural light* left to us; for that only can judg of things necessary, but not of such things as depend upon the meer pleasure of God: Therefore a Divine Revelation there must be.

2. Since it is necessary that God should some way or another reveal his mind to his People; it must be done by *Oracles*, *Visions*, *Dreams*, or by *extraordinary Messengers*, who by word of mouth might convey it to us; or else by *writing*, and by *ordinary teachers*, whose *lips may preserve knowledg* in the Church. The former ways might suffice, while God saw fit to reveal but a few Truths, and such as did not burden the Memory; and men were long-lived and of great simplicity; and the Church was confined within a small compass of ground, and not liable to so many miseries and changes as now in the latter ages: But when once God had spoken to us by his Son, these extraordinary ways ceased; *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. *God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last times spoken unto us by his Son.* As formerly God did speak πολυτρόπως, in divers manners, that is to say, by Visions, Oracles, Dreams, &c. so πολυμερῶς, at sundry times, by several steps & degrees he acquainted the World with the Truths necessary for man to know; delivering them out *by portions*, not all together at once, till he *came who had the Spirit without measure*, Joh. 3. 34. the Prophets to whom God revealed himself before by Visions, Oracles, Dreams, or the Coming of the Spirit upon them had the Spirit ἐκ μέτρου by *measure*, to fit them for some *particular errand* or message, on which God sent

ſent them. But when God ſent his Son out of his boſom to reveal the whole Doctrine of Faith *at once*, and to declare his Fathers Will with *full authority* and *power*, he fixed and cloſed up the Rule of Faith. So 'twas not fit that after him there ſhould come any *Extraordinary Nuntio's* and *Embaſſadours* from Heaven, or any other ſhould be owned as *Infallible Meſſengers*; but ſuch as he immediately ſent abroad in the World to Diſciple the Nations: Therefore all former extraordinary Ways ceaſed, and we are left to the ordinary Rule ſtated by Chriſt.

3. Being left to the ordinary Rule it was neceſſary it ſhould be taught not only by word of mouth, but committed to writing; for Chriſt is aſcended into Heaven, and the Apoſtles do not live for ever: And we have no men now that are immediately and divinely inſpired; and ordinary Paſtors and Teachers cannot make new Articles of Faith, but do only build on the *Apoſtles foundation*, 1 Cor. 3. 10. or that *divinely inſpired Doctrine* which they delivered to the Church. Yea, that Doctrine cannot well be preſerved from *oblivion* and *corruption* without Writing, therefore God accounted this the ſafeſt way. Thoſe things that are only delivered by word of mouth, or from hand to hand, may eaſily be *changed*, *corrupted*, *or utterly loſt*. Certainly, if you conſider mans *ſloth*, *treachery*, *levity*, and the many *vile affections* which may eaſily induce him to *extinguiſh* or *corrupt* the Truth which is contrary to them; you will ſee that it is neceſſary that there ſhould be a ſure *Authentick Record*, by which *Truth* and *Error* might be tried and diſtinguiſhed. Yea, that the *Church* which is diſperſed throughout the World might have *truth at hand*, and *particular Believers* have this Doctrine ever by them for their *comfort* and *uſe*; it being the property of a bleſſed man *to delight in the Law of God*, *and to exerciſe himſelf therein day and night*, *Pſal.* 1. 2. In ſhort, while the Apoſtles were living 'twas good to take the Tradition from *their mouth*; but now they are dead, we take it from *their Writings*. Surely if God ſaw ſome Writing neceſſary when thoſe extraordinary ways (we ſpake of before) were in uſe, and the Church of the Old Teſtament was in a much quieter ſtate than the Church of the New. I ſay, if ſome Writing were neceſſary then, it is more neceſſary now; for the Chriſtian Church is more expoſed to dreadful ſtorms *of perſecution*, the *deceits of Hereticks* of all ſorts, eſpecially to *the frauds of Antichriſt*, which we are forewarned of in this Chapter; and are detected and diſcovered by their contrariety to the *written word*.

4. This Truth being written, it is both *a ſafe* and *a full Rule* for us to walk by; it is a *ſafe Rule* becauſe it is written by the *Apoſtles and Evangeliſts*, *holy men moved by the Holy Ghoſt*. The Apoſtles did not loſe their Infallibility when they committed what they preached to Writing; the ſame Spirit that aſſiſted them in delivering the Doctrine by word of mouth, aſſiſted them alſo when they delivered it by writing: and it is *a full* and *ſufficient Rule*, becauſe it containeth all things which are neceſſary for Men *to believe* and do in order to eternal life. Let them name

what

let them name what is neceſſary beyond what is *recommended* there, or may be *deduced* from thence: yea it doth contain not only *all the Eſſential* but alſo the *Integral* parts of the Chriſtian Religion; and therefore nothing can be any part of our Religion which is not there. The direction of old was, *Iſa.* 8. 20. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them.* Every thing was then tried *by Moſes and the Prophets*, and every thing muſt be now tried *by the Prophets and Apoſtles*, which is *our foundation* of *Faith*, *Worſhip*, and *Obedience*, Eph. 2. 20.

5. That which we blame in *the Papiſts* is, That they cry up a *private*, *unproved*, *unwritten Tradition* of their own, as of *equal Authority* with this *ſafe* and *full* Rule which is contained in the Written Word of God. Their crime and fault may be conſidered partly with reſpect to the *Object* and *Matter*, That theſe Traditions are not *indifferent Cuſtoms*, but *Eſſential Points*, neceſſary to *Faith* and *Chriſtian Practice*; and ſo though a Chriſtian be never ſo thorough and ſound in his Obedience to the Word of God, and true to *the Baptiſmal Covenant*, yet if he ſubmitteth not to theſe Unwritten Traditions, he wants ſome Point neceſſary to *Faith* and *Practice*, and ſo to *Life Eternal*; which is contrary to *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is Baptized ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not ſhall be damned.* And *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*: Partly as *to the Subject*, as they make their *own faction* to be the *only keepers* of theſe things, and that nothing is to be owned as *Apoſtolical Tradition*, but what is delivered as ſuch by their Authority; which is to leave the Church to the Tyranny and Uſurpation of a *corrupt Faction*, to declare for Apoſtolical Tradition any thing which ſerveth their *Ends* and *Intereſts*, and for which no *true Hiſtorical evidence* is produced. Now the unjuſt and fraudulent Practices which they have uſed to promote this Uſurpation over the Churches of Chriſt, render them of all men moſt unfit to be truſted in this kind; partly with reſpect to *the manner*, they will have theſe things to be received *Pari reverentia & pietatis affectu*; With the ſame reverence and pious affection with which we receive the holy Scriptures; and ſo *mans poſt* is ſet by Gods, and *unproved Traditions* equalled with *Doctrins of Faith:* their *opinion* is bad enough, but their *practice* is worſe, for there they ſhew they value theſe things more than the Scriptures; as Superſtition always aboundeth in its own things. Did ever any of their Doctors ſay the ſame things of Traditions which they take the boldneſs to ſay of Scripture? Did they ever call them *Pen and Inkhorn, or Parchment Divinity, a Noſe of Wax, a dumb Rule, an obſcure and ambiguous Doctrine:* Theſe *Blaſphemies* they vent boldly againſt the Scripture, but did they ever ſpeak thus of Traditions? and again their common People are a thouſand times better inſtructed in their Traditions than in the *Doctrine of Salvation*; they skill more of *Lent*, and *Ember-weeks*, *&c.* than they truly underſtand

the Doctrine of *Mans misery* and *remedy*: And call you this *equal reverence* and *pious affection* to the *Scriptures* and *Traditions?* Partly because they would never give us a *perfect Catalogue* of Unwritten Traditions necessary to be observed by all Christians; it may be left they should amaze the People with the multitude of them, or else that the People may not know how many of their Doctrins are destitute of Scripture-proof, and so they plainly be discovered to be imposers on the belief of the Christian World.

6. Though we blame this in Papists, yet we reject not *all Tradition*: 1. Because Scripture it self is a Tradition, as we proved before, and is conveyed to us by the most *credible means*, which we have no reason to doubt of; the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* were preserved by the *Jews*, to whom were committed the Oracles of God, *Rom.* 3. 2. And *Protestants* receive all the Books which they admitted into their *Canon*. And for the Books of the *New Testament* the Christian Church hath received them as the Writings of those whose Names they bear, and by the *constant Universal Tradition* of the Church they are transmitted to us; and we have no more reason to doubt of them, than we do of Statutes and Laws made by Kings and Parliaments, who lived long before we had a being. Yea, we may be much more confident, as the matter is of greater weight and consequence, and these Writings have the *signature* and stamp of Gods Spirit on them, and have been blessed by God to the converting and sanctifying of many Souls; and have been delivered down to us by a succession of Believers unto this very day; and by them Christianity hath been preserved in the World notwithstanding the wickedness of it; and hath held up head against all the encounters of time. The persecutions of adverse Powers, have not suppressed it, nor the disputes of Enemies silenced the Profession of it; but still from age to age Gods Truth is received and transmitted to Posterity.

2. Because the proof of Christianity depending upon matter of Fact, chiefly Christs rising from the dead, it can only be proved by a Testimony, which in so extraordinary a case must be made valuable and authorized to the World by the Miracles accompanying it. Now the notice of these things is brought to us by Tradition, which being unquestionable, giveth us as good ground of Faith as it did to them that lived in the Apostles time, and heard their Doctrine, and saw their Miracles. Gods wonderful works were never intended for the benefit of that Age only in which they were done, but for the benefit also of those that should hear of them by any credible means whatsoever, *Psal.* 145. 4. *Joel* 1. 3. *Psal.* 78. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. These things were told them *that they might set their hope in God, &c.*

3. Because there are some Doctrins drawn by just consequence from Scripture, but are the more confirmed to us when they are backed with *constant Church-usage* and *practice*; as Baptism of Infants, Lords-day, Singing of Psalms in our Publick Worship, *&c.*

4. Be-

4. Becauſe there are certain words which are not found in Scripture indeed, yet agreeable thereunto, and are very uſeful to diſcover the frauds of Hereticks, as *Trinity*, *Divine Providence*, *Conſubſtantial Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, *Satisfaction*, &c.

5. We reject not all Church-Hiſtory, or the Records of ancient Writers concerning the Providences of God in their days, in owning the Goſpel, which make much for our inſtruction in manners, and are helps to encourage us to put our truſt in God.

6. There are *certain Uſages* and *innocent Cuſtoms*, or *Circumſtances* common or ſacred, and other actions, which we deſpiſe not but acknowledg and receive as far as their own variable nature and condition requireth, not rejecting them becauſe anciently practiſed; nor regarding them when the general Law of Edification requireth the omiſſion of them. But that which we deteſt is, That the Traditions of Men ſhould be made equal in Dignity and Authority with the expreſs Revelation of God: Yea, that manifeſt Corruptions and Uſurpations as making *Rome the Miſtreſs of other Churches*; and ſuperinducing the Pope *as the Head of the Univerſal viſible Church, and the Vicar of Chriſt without his leave and appointment*; and ſuch-like other Points ſhould be obtruded upon the World as Apoſtolical Traditions, and to be received with like Religious reverence as we do Articles of Faith ſet down in Scripture: This is that we cannot ſufficiently abhor as apparently falſe and deſtructive to Chriſtianity.

The Propoſitions drawn out of the Text in this Sermon are theſe.

1. Whatever aſſurance we have of Gods preſerving us in the Truth, yet we are bound to uſe diligence and caution.

2. Our diligence and caution is to be imployed about this, that we may ſtand faſt in the Faith of Chriſt, and the profeſſion and practice of Godlineſs.

3. That the means of ſtanding faſt in the Faith of Chriſt, and the profeſſion and practice of Godlineſs is by holding the Traditions which were taught by the Holy Apoſtles.

4. That while the Apoſtles were in being there were two ways of delivering the Truth by word of mouth, and Writing.

5. That now when they are long ſince gone to God, and we cannot receive from them the Doctrine of life by word of mouth; We muſt ſtick to the Scriptures or Written Word.

4. Because there are certain words which are not found in Scripture indeed, yet agreeable thereunto, and are very useful to declare the Grounds of Heretics, as Trinity, Divine Providence, Original Sin, &c.

5. Words properly and improperly used in Scripture.

6. Which are more necessary to be known by us, in our Endeavours to encourage us to put our Trust in God.

7. There are certain Types and Ancient Customs, or Circumstances of Things, which may vary with the Times, which we ought not to observe now, nor regarding them because anciently practised; nor regarding them when the general Law of Edification requireth the contrary thereof. But that which we doubt is, That the Traditions not found in the Scripture, and Authority with the express Revelation of God: Yea, that manifest Corruptions and Usurpations in the Church of Christ, and the Pride of Clergy, and Hypocrisy of the Carnal subtle Church, and the Fear of Civil without Law and Displeasure; and such like other Points should be obtruded on the World as Apostolical Traditions, and to be received with the Reverence as we do Articles of Faith set down in Scripture; that we should so unadvisedly abhor as apparently false and destructive to Christian.

The Propositions drawn out of the Text in this Sermon are these.

1. Whatever affiance we have of Gods preserving us in the Truth, yet we are bound to use diligence and caution.

2. Our diligence and caution is to be employed about this, that we may find full in the Faith of Christ, and the practise and practise of Holy Apostles.

3. That the means of standing fast in the Faith of Christ, and the practise and practise of Godliness is by holding the Traditions which were taught by the Holy Apostles.

4. That while the Apostles were in being there were two ways of delivering the Truth by word of mouth, and Writing.

5. That now when they are long since gone to God, and we cannot receive from them the Doctrine of life by word of mouth; We must flie to the Scriptures or Written Word.

SERMON VII.

Popery is a Novelty, and the Proteſtants Religion was not only before *Luther*, but the ſame that was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Jer. 6. 16. *Thus ſaith the Lord, ſtand ye in the way and ſee, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye ſhall find reſt for your Souls: But they ſaid, we will not walk therein.*

ALl Men in this World having for their Conſtituent parts a Mortal Body (*a*), and an Immortal Soul, are paſſing out of this Life into another: Out of this, becauſe of the Mortality (*b*) of the Body; into another, becauſe of the Immortality of the Soul. And all both good and bad are daily and hourly travelling to an everlaſting and unchangeable ſtate, whoſe Bodies ſhall be quickly turned into lifeleſs duſt, and their Souls enter into Heaven or Hell, and be with God or Devil (*c*), in Joy or Torment, when they come to their Journeys end; and according to the way they now walk in, ſo it will be with them for ever: Thoſe that walk in the way chalked out by God, at the end of this Life ſhall have the end of their Faith, and Hope and Holineſs, the Salvation of their Souls; but thoſe that walk after the fleſh, and in the ways of ſin, ſhall find Hell to be at the end of their walk. Therefore it is of Infinite concernment to all, to obſerve and do what is preſcribed in the Text, in which are contained theſe Parts following.

(*a*) Ψυχάριον ἐ βασάζον νέκρον. *Epictet.*

(*b*) In terra orimur, & in terra morimur, revertentes in eam unde ſumus aſſumpti. *Bernard in ſerm. St. Martin.*

(*c*) Bona mors juſti propter requiem, melior propter novitatem, optima propter ſecuritatem. Mala peccatorum mors in mundi amiſſione, pejor in carnis ſeparatione, peſſima in vermis igniſque duplici contritione. *Idem Epiſt.* 105.

I. The *Duties* that are *enjoined*, and they are two. First, *to ask and enquire* after the right way that leads to Rest and Happiness; a Metaphor (*d*) taken from a Man that is upon his Journey, and not well acquainted with the way to his intended place, stands still and asketh, Which is my way to such a Town, I am bound and bent for such a Country? and if I mistake my way, I lose my self, my labour and my business; and being directed doth heedfully observe what is said unto him, and carefully remembers the marks that are told him, by which he might conclude that he is in his direct and ready way. Sirs, this is your case, you are bound for Heaven, you would all be happy when you die, and if *you mistake your way, you lose your selves, your Souls and Bodies too, and God and Christ, and Happiness, and all, and that for ever:* Stand then, and earnestly enquire (*e*), which is your way, and diligently observe what are the Marks whereby you might know that you are in the road to a Blessed, Glorious Life: and these in the Text are two.

First, It is the *old Way*; Seek not out new paths to Heaven, keep in the old Way that all the Millions of Saints now happy in the enjoyment of their God, went in: If you would get to the place where they be, you must go the same way they did. The old Way that *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob* went; the old Way that *Moses* and *David*, *Peter* and *Paul*, and all the holy, humble, and believing, penitent People of God did go.

Secondly, It is the *good Way* as well as *old*; for though Goodness was before Wickedness, yet every way that is old is not good (*f*); there is the old Way of *Swearing* and *Lying*, and *Drunkenness*; there is the old Way of *Hypocrisie*, *Impenitency*, and *Unbelief*; the old Way of *Whoredom*, and hating *Holiness*: This hath been the old Way, but a bad one, and that leads to Damnation: If you be in this Way and hold on in this Way, and go forwards, and do not turn, and that *quickly too*, you will be in everlasting torments, and that *quickly too*. Stand then and see that your Way be the good and the old Way.

Secondly, (*g*) The next Duty in the Text enjoined, is *to walk in this Way both old and good*, when you have found it; for if a man have the most exact knowledg of his Way, & shall sit down, and shall sit down or stand still, and not walk in it, he will never come to the place that Way doth lead unto. The Way is pointed out by God himself unto you; get up then, arise and walk therein, and that with haste and speed; your Way is to a long Eternity, the night of Death is coming upon you, be daily jogging on, do not loyter in your way; time goeth on, therefore so do you.

II. In the Text there is by what *Authority* (h) *you are thus strictly enjoyned* to ask for, and walk in the good old Way; that is, by *Divine Authority*. [*Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see, and ask, &c.*] It is the Lord that made thee, that doth thus command thee; it is *that* Lord that doth preserve thee, in whom thou dost live, and move, and haſt

(*d*) Similitudine utitur. *Calv. in loc.* Facite ut viatores solent, ubi dubitant, quà eundum sit. *Grot. in loc.*

(*e*) ושאלו לנתיבות: Et Interrogate, (sub. alios sapientiores. *Vatab. in loc.*

עולם Antiquis per quas iverunt Abraham, Jacob, &c. *Grot.*

(*f*) There is the old way of *Cain*, Jude *v.* 11. 1 *Joh.* 3. 12. *Gen.* 4. 8. and the old way of *Balaam*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 15. but the way of Sin, though never so old leads to Hell, *Mat.* 7. 13.

(*g*) והלכו־בה Per Metaphoram de vita, moribus, & actionibus.

(*h*) Hic docet Propheta, non posse extenuari culpam populi, quasi errore peccasset quoniam satis superq; admonitus à Deo fuerat, *Calv.*

haſt thy being, that hath kept thee out of Hell all this while; thou haſt been going in the wrong way, and running in the paths that lead to deſtruction and damnation; it is *that* Lord that can damn thee, when he will, and that can inflict the puniſhments and plagues upon thee, that are due unto thee, for thy ſin againſt him; that could this day and hour caſt thy Body to the duſt, and thy Soul to Devils, that doth command thee to ſtand and ſee, whither thou art going; he ſeeth the way wherein thou art walking, and out of pity to thee, calleth after thee, ſaying, Poor Sinner! why art thou ſo ſwift, and makeſt ſuch haſte in the way of Sin? Why doſt thou run with ſo much ſpeed to a place of torment, as if thou couldeſt not get thither ſure enough, or ſoon enough; whereas the Way thou walkeſt in (except thou turn) will bring thee to eternal miſery, ſurely and quickly too? Oh ſtand and ſee, whither thou art going! ſtand and ſee that at the end of this thy ſinful walk thou wilt come unto a lake of burning Brimſtone; to a doleful Dungeon, to a place of torment, and of utter darkneſs! Oh ſtand and ſee, and look about thee if thou canſt behold any that are going to eternal Happineſs walking in that way and road that thou art daily travelling in! I therefore charge thee upon pain of everlaſting torment, as thou loveſt thy Soul, or ever wouldſt be received unto everlaſting joy and happineſs, go not on, turn back again; thou art out of thy way to reſt and glory, ſtand then and aſk, for the good old way and walk therein.

3. Here is *the incouragement propounded*, to ſtir you up to aſk for, and walk in the good old way, and that is *(i) reſt for your Souls*. Reſt in ſome meaſure, and from ſome things for the preſent, and reſt perfect and perpetual in Heaven hereafter for ever. Oh what ails the ſons of men to be ſo mad upon their luſts and ways of ſin, that though God doth threaten them with everlaſting, reſtleſs, and [hereafter] remedileſs torments, will yet go on in the way that leads them thither! and though God promiſeth a place and ſtate of reſt, and love, and life, if they will turn their hearts and feet unto the ways that would bring them to it, will notwithſtanding keep their ſinful courſe! which brings to the next part in the words.

(i) ומצאו מרגוע לנפשכם רגע Subito motus, concitatus, volutus fuit; tranſitive, movit, volutavit, per antiphraſin, quievit. *Jer.* 49. 19. & 31. 2. Iſa. 51. 4. *Schindler.*

4. *The Obſtinacy and wilful rebellion of Sinners, and their reſolute purpoſe to the contrary* (k). God commands you to walk in a good way, but you will not; he promiſeth you reſt and happineſs, if you will, but yet you will not; and doth threaten you with death and hell, and yet you will not. Oh the hardneſs of your hearts! Oh the ſtubbornneſs of your wills! how great is it, when the *Precepts*, nor the *Promiſes*, nor the *threatnings* of the great, eternal God, will not make you bend, nor bow, nor buckle to his revealed Will! It is your own Will that will undo you, if you periſh. It is your Will that is the great enemy and re-

(k) Hic ſignificat Propheta tantum ſtetiſſe per Judæos quo minus fruerentur rebus proſperis, & tranquillo ſtatu — & ſponte fuiſſe miſeros, quia Deus propoſuerat illis felicem ſtatum, ſed contemptam fuiſſe hanc gratiam ab ipſis, idque perviaciter, nam hoc ſonant verba, ubi dicunt, non ambulabimus, *Calvin.*

bel againſt the bleſſed God, againſt his holy Law and Ways; do not plead and ſay, *thou canſt not* walk in the good old Way, when the reaſon is rather, becauſe *thou wilt not.* It is not ſo much your Impoteney, as your obſtinacy that you do not leave your ſinful, and your wicked ways. You can forbear to ſwear, but you will not; you can leave your drunkenneſs, who compels you, who doth conſtrain and force you? you can but will not (*l*); who puts the cup ſo often to thy mouth but thine own hand, commanded ſo to do by thy own will? Who turns thy tongue to curſe and to blaſpheme the holy name of God but thy own will? Who compels thy feet to carry thee to a Whore-houſe? Doſt thou not voluntarily move thitherward, and thou goeſt, not becauſe thou *canſt not* forbear, but becauſe thou *wilt not* forbear to go? Moreover, as thou canſt leave many of thy wicked ways, if thou wilt, ſo thou canſt ſet upon a better courſe of life if thou wilt. Thou canſt go to Sermons if thou wilt, and thou canſt conſider of what thou hearſt if thou wilt; and thou canſt fall down upon thy knees and pray to God if thou wilt; who doth hinder thee but thine own will? And if thou wilt not do what thou canſt, is it not a plain caſe that thou wouldeſt not do more, though thou couldeſt? Do not plead that thou canſt not, till thou haſt done the beſt that thou canſt do, which yet unto this day thou never haſt done. If thou wert *now a dying*, canſt thou ſay, thou haſt done thy beſt, and the moſt that thou couldeſt do to leave the way of ſin, and to walk in a better way? thy own Conſcience would condemn thee, and tell thee that thou haſt not. The day is haſtning when it ſhall be roundly told thee, in thy ear, thou mighteſt have been holy and ſo happy, but thou wouldſt not. Thou waſt called to come to Chriſt that thou mighteſt have lived, but thou wouldſt not. Thou waſt exhorted to ask for, and walk in the good old way; but the reaſon, *why thou didſt not, was becauſe thou wouldeſt not.* And how deſervedly are they damned, that are wilful in their ways, and are reſolved that in the good way they will not walk.

(*l*) Reprobatio Dei non ſubſtrahit aliquid de potentia reprobati—Unde licet aliquis non poſſit gratiam adipiſci, qui reprobatur à Deo, tamen quod in hoc peccatum vel illud labatur, ex ejus libero arbitrio contingit: Unde & meritò ſibi imputatur in culpam. *Aquin. par.* 1. *Queſt.* 23. *Art.* 3.

The Text according to theſe Parts contained in it, would afford ſo many Doctrines, which would yield matter for many Practical Sermons, but muſt all be omitted, becauſe I am limited to endeavour to make good this Poſition, *viz.* That *Popery is a Novelty, and the Proteſtants Religion was not only before* Luther, *but the ſame that was taught by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles.*

For the more clear and diſtinct proceeding in the handling of this Aſſertion, I ſhall caſt what I have to ſay (and can bring into one Sermon) into this Method:

Firſt, I *ſhall premiſe ſome certain Propoſitions for the better ſtating of the matter in hand.*

Secondly, *I will give you a parallel or compariſon of the Doctrines taught by the Prophets, Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, the Doctrines of the Proteſtants, or Reformed Churches, and the Doctrines of the Papiſts*; by which you may

may eaſily diſcern, that ours is the old and true, but theirs a new and falſe Religion.

Thirdly, *I will ſhew you that the ſame Religion and Doctrine profeſſed and owned by the Proteſtants was* (after Chriſt and his Apoſtles) *before* Luther, *taught, and received by many.*

Fourthly, *I will give you an account of ſome of the material, eſſential Points of Popery, when they firſt ſprung up in the Church, and when firſt made Articles of Faith, with ſuch ſtrictneſs that they ſhould be accounted Hereticks that did not profeſs to believe them, but would oppoſe them*; that by their original and riſe, you may rightly conclude that the charge of Novelty laid upon the Popiſh Religion is a juſt charge.

Fifthly, *I will make ſome Practical Application of the whole.*

The firſt part of the Method propounded contains theſe Eight Propoſitions.

Firſt Propoſition.

That the ordinary way in which loſt ſinners ſince the Fall of Adam *have been recovered and reſtored to Life and Salvation, as to the Eſſentials of the Covenant of Grace, in all ages hath been one and the ſame* (*m*). For though God hath at ſundry times and in divers manners revealed his Will unto his Church, yet the Covenant of Grace (caſt out to fallen man as a plank after ſhipwrack) under various external Diſpenſations, hath been the ſame; under the Law adminiſtred by *Promiſes, Prophecies, Sacrifices and Circumciſion*, the *Paſchal Lamb*, and *other Types and Ordinances* delivered to the People of the *Jews* (*n*), all pointing *at Chriſt to come*; under the Goſpel by the *Preaching of the Word*, and *Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, Baptiſm, and the Lords-Supper*, which is done in Commemoration of the Death of Chriſt, *already paſt*. This way hath been the ſame to Heaven all along through Chriſt, ſucceſſively from *Adam* to our days, and will be the ſame to the end of the World; which we might learn from the excellent Harmony, perfect agreement betwixt the Doctrine of *Moſes*, the Prophets, and Chriſt and his Apoſtles; for theſe declaring the whole counſel of God, *Act.* 18. 27. did yet preach no new Doctrine concerning Chriſt and Salvation by him, but what *Moſes* and the Prophets did ſay, and that alſo in reference to the Gentiles, as well as to the *Jews*, *Act.* 26. 22, 23. To believe on Chriſt, to love God above all, to repent, and mortifie Sin, to be ſanctified and renewed after the Image of God, to be obedient to the Will of God, hath been the good way from of old. The new change in outward Adminiſtrations made by Chriſt, and the Apoſtles did not make a New way to Heaven, though the old Diſpenſations then did ceaſe, and give place to thoſe appointed by Chriſt, which with the Doctrines of the Apoſtles are retained in the Reformed Church, but are depraved, corrupted and departed from by the Church of *Rome*, as will appear by the parallel of Doctrines.

(*m*) Ea quippe fides juſtos ſervavit antiquos, quæ & nos. *i.e.* Mediatoris Dei & hominis Jeſu Chriſti. *Aug. de natur. & grat:* cap. 44. Heb. 1: 1. πολυμερῶς & πολυτρόπως.

(*n*) Chriſti veri Sacrificii multiplicia variaq; ſigna erant ſacrificia priſca ſanctorum, cum hoc unum per multa figuraretur, tanquam verbis multis res una diceretur, ut ſine faſtidio multum commendatur *Aug: de civit: Dei, lib:* 10: *cap:* 20.

Second

Second Propoſition.

Antiquity is not a mark of a true Church; a Church of a long ſtanding and continuance ſucceſſively from age to age might be a falſe Church: The Church of *Rome* contrary *to all reaſon* makes Antiqnity a mark (*o*), whereby a true Church might be known; and *contrary to all Hiſtory* brags of her own Antiquity. But that which is a diſtinguiſhing mark to difference one thing from another muſt be found *in* (p) *one kind, in all of that kind, only in that kind, and yet always in it*; as a man hath two feet, but thereby cannot be diſtinguiſhed from ſome other Creatures, becauſe this is common to birds as well as men: So to be skilful in Muſick is proper only to man, but not found in every man, and therefore no mark to know a man by; for one that is no Muſician is a true and real man, as well as he that is: So alſo there might be ſomething proper to one kind of beings, and only to that kind, and to every one of that kind, but not always; as Laughter to Mankind only, and to every one, but not always; for though no Creature can laugh but Man, yet one is as true and real Man when he doth not uſe that action, as when he doth. Again, though Man only is endued with Learning of Arts and Sciences amongſt living Creatures, yet to ſay this is a mark of a Man, were to ſay that moſt Men in the World were no Men; for the moſt are not ſo learned, and the Men that are now learned, were not always ſo, and yet had then the true and real nature of Men. But if you ſay, a Man hath a power or faculty to laugh, you then give a plain mark to diſtinguiſh him from all others, becauſe this power is proper *to Mankind only, to every one of Mankind, only, and always*; and therefore this being a property of Mankind, and inſeparable from any of that kind, a difference to diſtinguiſh man from all other living Creatures might be taken from thence, beſides the conſtitutive ſpecifical difference.

(*o*) Secunda nota Eccleſiæ eſt antiquitas; noſtra autem Eccleſia, quam adverſarii Papiſticam vocant, eſt illa ipſa, quam Chriſtus inſtituit, & proinde vetuſtior omnibus ſectis hæreticorum. *Bell. de concil. & Eccleſ. l.4. c.5.*

(*p*) Proprium convenit ſoli alicui ſpeciei, omnibuſq; illius Individuis & ſemper. Tres notarum conditiones ponit, *Bellarm.* 1. Debent eſſe propriæ non communes. debent eſſe. 2. Notiores, eâ re cujus ſunt notæ, alioqui non ſunt notæ, ſed ignotæ. 3. Sunt inſeparabiles à vera Eccleſia. *De Concil. & Eccleſ. Lib.4. cap. 2.*

By this plain familiar inſtance the common and unlearned people, (to whoſe capacity the deſign is to accommodate this Sermon) might underſtand ſomething of the nature of a mark, whereby one thing might be known from another, and applying this to the buſineſs in hand might make a judgment, that the Popiſh braggings of Antiquity, (alone conſidered) will fall ſhort of a demonſtration, or evidence, that the Church of *Rome* is the only true Church, that hereby ſhe cannot prove her ſelf to be a true Church; and that upon theſe two Grounds or Reaſons.

1. Becauſe *Antiquity is ſeparable from a true Church*, as the Church of God in *Adams* days was a true Church, and yet it was not then an ancient Church, when it firſt began; and the Chriſtian Church in the Apoſtles days was a true Chriſtian Church, and yet it was not then an ancient *Chriſtian* Church, no more than an Infant newly born might be ſaid to be an old man, and yet it is a true man, though not old.

2. Becauſe Antiquity is not only ſeparable from a true Church, but

is

is *alſo common to other things now as well as to a true Church*; yea, it might be ſpoken of the Synagogue of Satan, for as much as Satan hath had his followers in the World for many thouſand years; and there have been many wicked and ungodly ſocieties of men, far more ancient than the Church of *Rome*, or any *Pope* the Head thereof. So that the Antiquity that the Church of *Rome* boaſts of (but hath not) cannot prove it to be the true Church of Chriſt, any more than the Synagogue of Satan. And that Antiquity, that indeed ſhe hath, together with her Spiritual fornication may evidence her to be an *old harlot*, but not the true Church; for when ſhe ſaith, ſhe is ſo old as to be the Mother of all other Churches, we can name ſome Churches that ſhe would have to be her Daughters to be more ancient than the Church of *Rome*; but it is abſurd to ſay the Mother is younger than any of the Daughters.

Third Propoſition.

As Antiquity is not a mark of a true Church, ſo neither is *Antiquity a note of true Doctrine*; for although all truth is more ancient than error (error being a corruption of truth) yet every Doctrine that is old, or of many hundred (*q*) years ſtanding is not therefore true; for there are *old errors*, and *old hereſies*, yea ſuch as are more ancient than thoſe that are *properly and formally* Popiſh Errors. There are the old Errors and Hereſies of *Cerinthus*, *Ebion*, *Arrius*, and many more, of a ſooner and more early original, than the main Doctrines of Popery, that are eſſential to that Religion; and if we judg of Doctrines meerly by Antiquity, many Hereſies have the precedency before Popery. Since then Wickedneſs and Error can plead Antiquity of many Ages; it is plain that *Antiquity is a praiſe or diſpraiſe, according to the nature of the thing of which it is ſpoken; if it be good, the older, the better; if it be bad, the older, the worſer*; continuance in Sin being an aggravation of it; as an old Swearer, an old Drunkard or Idolater is worſe than one that hath lately taken up ſuch wicked practices. Antiquity of Doctrine and Worſhip without truth and purity being but (*r*) grey-headed Error and Sin, it follows that the longer the Church of *Rome* hath embraced ſuch Worſhip, and taught ſuch Doctrines, ſhe is not ſo venerable for her Antiquity, as vile for her Iniquity.

(*q*) Quodcunque adverſus veritatem ſapit, hoc erit hæreſis, etiam vetus conſuetudo. *Tertul. de Virg. Veland.*

(*r*) Conſuetudo ſine veritate, vetuſtas erroris eſt. *Cypr. Epiſt. ad Pompeium.*

Fourth Propoſition.

Some of the Popiſh Doctrines, and ſome parts of Popiſh Worſhip are older, and of a longer ſtanding than ſome other be. *Rome* was not built in one day; and the body and ſyſteme of Popiſh Doctrine, as now it is held, was not finiſhed in one age. Popery came in by degrees, and Antichriſt did riſe to this height as now he is in, ſtep by ſtep. The (*s*) Queſtion propounded by the Papiſts to be reſolved by the Prote-

(*s*) In omni inſigni mutatione religionis ſemper iſta ſex demonſtrari poſſunt. 1. Auctor ejus. 2. Dogma aliquod novum. 3. Tempus quo cæpit. 4. Locus ubi cæpit. 5. Quis eam oppugnaverit. 6. Exiguus aliquis cætus unde paulatim aliis accedentibus, cæperit. Nihil autem horum de nobis oſtendere poſſunt, (ſub. Hæretici.) *Bellarm. de Concil. & Eccleſ. lib. 4. cap. 5.*

ſtants

ſtants, ſaying, *Who was the firſt Pope that brought in their Religion? and who was the firſt that made all the Innovations we complain of?* is ridiculous and abſurd, ſuppoſing that to be introduced into the Church by one man, in one age, which was brought in gradually, by many men, in many ages.

Fifth Propoſition.

Thoſe things that are eſſential to our Religion, are owned by the Papiſts themſelves; for they do profeſs to own the *Scripture* to be the Word of God, and that it is certainly true; but do add their own *Traditions*, things not contained in the Scripture, yet *neceſſary* to Salvation, which we cannot receive. They own *Chriſt to be the Head of the Church*, and ſo do we; but they add and ſay, That the *Pope is the Head* of the Univerſal Church alſo, but ſo do not we. They own *Baptiſm and the Lords-Supper*, ſo do we; but they add five Sacraments more, which we deny. They own that there is an *Heaven and an Hell*, as well as we, but they teach that there was a place diſtinct from both, in which the Souls of Believers were before Chriſts death. And that there is a Purgatory, and a place for the Souls of Infants, *diſtinct* from Heaven and Hell, all which we do deny. They own the *Merits of Chriſt*, and ſo do we; but they add their own Merits, which we deny; and ſo in other Points. So that the Controverſie betwixt us and them is not, Whether what we hold be true and old, for that is granted by the Papiſts themſelves (*t*), as to the eſſential parts of our Religion, but about what they have invented, and added to the true Religion. All our Religion is contained in the Scripture, and what is there, we own, and nothing elſe as neceſſary to Salvation. The ſum of our Religion is comprehended in the *Ten Commandments*, *Creed*, *and Lords-Prayer*, which the Papiſts alſo do confeſs and own. So that our Religion is paſt diſpute, and is in a manner granted to us: But whether the Popiſh Doctrines as ſuch, be true and old, is the very Controverſie betwixt us and them.

(*t*) Nota ſecundo ea quæ ſunt ſimpliciter neceſſaria Apoſtolos conſueviſſe omnibus prædicare, — Dico, illa omnia Scripta eſſe ab Apoſtolis, quæ ſunt omnibus neceſſaria, & quæ ipſi palam omnibus vulgo prædicaverunt. *Bell. de Verb. Dei: Lib. 4. cap. 11.*

Sixth Propoſition.

From the former follows this, That *there are more things eſſential to the Popiſh Religion, as ſuch then there are to our Religion.* They do own our Eſſentials, but we deny theirs. Thoſe in which we and they do agree, are acknowledged by both to be true and old; thoſe in which we differ from them, we truly ſay are New.

Seventh Propoſition.

The Reformation of the Church doth not conſiſt in bringing in of New things, but in caſting them out, and paring them off: It is a groſs miſtake that in the Reformation, *in and ſince Luthers time*, the Church hath brought in new Doctrines, and rejected the old: But (which is the truth) hath caſt away the new, and retaineth the old. Gold and droſs were mixed together, the Jewel of Truth was hid under the filth of corrupt Doctrines, our Reformers kept the Jewel and the Gold, and caſt the droſs and filth away. *The Reception of the old Doctrine, and the Re-*

Rejection of the New is that which made the Reformation. And if the Church of *Rome* would own what is in the Scripture, and no more, as neceſſary to Salvation, and would cut off the New, which they have added to the Old, we and they ſhould be of the ſame Religion. Our Religion was perfect and compleat before the Doctrine and the Worſhip of the Church of *Rome*, (as now it is) were in being; and if you give a Coat to a Man, and he afterwards put ſome pieces to it, long after it was a Coat, if you ask a *Mendicant*, or a Beggar in the ſtreet, he may tell you, that is the New part which was put to it, after it was a perfect Coat.

Eight Propoſition.

To know which is the Old Religion and the New, we muſt keep to the Word (u) *of God, as the rule and teſt thereof.* What is not in the Word of God, no way, neither *expreſly, nor by juſt, immediate, neceſſary conſequence*; and yet is made neceſſary to Salvation is certainly a New Religion; though it hath been taught many hundred years. Thus all falſe gods though long ſince ſerved and worſhipped are called New gods, that newly came up, *Deut.* 32. 17. The Old Religion then muſt be examined by the Old Rule, the Holy Scriptures; ſo that to determine this, we need not run to the *Canons* of the Church, the *Councils* of Men, to the *Decrees* of the Pope, to the *Writings* of the Fathers, which are all fallible, and of later ſtanding than the Word of God, as being before any ſuch *Councils, Canons, Conſtitutions* and *Writings of Men*, ſince the Apoſtles time. When therefore the Papiſts ask you, Where was your Religion before *Luther*? you might confidently anſwer, Where their Religion *never was, nor will be found*; and that is, in the holy Scriptures, which was long before *Luther* was, or the *Pope* either. But if you ask them, Where *was their Religion in the Apoſtles times, and ſeveral hundred years after Chriſt*, you will put them hard to it to ſhew you, nay they cannot do it.

(u) Si ad divinæ traditionis caput, & originem revertamur, ceſſat error humanus. *Cypr. Epiſt. ad Pomp.*

The ſecond General Head in the Method propoſed, is to give you a parallel of Doctrines taught by the *Prophets, Chriſt, and his Apoſtles*; by the *Proteſtants* or *Reformed Church*; by the *Papiſts* or the *Church of Rome*. The firſt ſhall be laid down *in the very words of Scripture*. The ſecond out of the *publick Confeſſions of faith of the Reformed Church* in *England*, and beyond the Seas. The Third out of *the Writings and Decretals of the Popes, Councils, Cardinals, and other Doctors* approved by the Church of *Rome*. By all which the Three Things contained in this Poſition will be made manifeſt. Firſt, That *the Doctrine of Proteſtants is the ſame, that was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles*. Secondly, *That therefore it was long before* Luther. Thirdly, That *the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *differing from, and being contrary to the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles muſt be a very Novelty*. But here I have not time nor room to make this Compariſon in all points of differing Doctrine betwixt us and them, but ſhall make choice of ſome out of many, but

enough to prove the thing asserted. A Parallel of the Doctrines of Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, the Protestants and Papists.

I. *Concerning the perfection and sufficiency of the Scripture unto Salvation.*

I. The Doctrine of the Prophets, Christ and Apostles concerning this Point:

Deut. 12. 32. *Whatsoever things I command you, observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.* Psal. 19. 7. *The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the Soul.* Joh. 20. 31. *But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name.* Gal. 1. 8. *But though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.* 9. *As I said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel to you, than that you have received, let him be accursed.* 2 Tim. 3. 15. *And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto Salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.* 16. *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.* 17. *That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.* Rev. 22. 18. *For I testifie unto every man that heareth the words of the Prophesie of this Book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book.* 19. *And if any man shall take away from the words of the Book of this Prophesie, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the holy City, and from the things which are written in this Book.*

II. The Doctrine of the Reformed Churches concerning the Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture unto Salvation.

(w) Church of Engl. Artic. 6. (w) *The holy Scripture containeth all things necessary for Salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite and necessary to Salvation.*

(x) Artic. 20. (x) *It is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing, that is contrary to Gods Word:——as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.*

(y) Assemb. Confession of Faith. *The whole Counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his own Glory, mans Salvation, Faith and Life, is either expresly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new Revelations of the Spirit, or Traditions of men* (y).

The Canonical Scripture, or the Word of God delivered by the Holy Ghost, and

and by the Prophets and Apoſtles propounded to the world is the moſt perfect and ancient Philoſophy, doth alone perfectly contain all piety, all rule of life (z).

(z) Confeſſio: Helvet. Synta. Confeſ. p. 67.

The Reformed Church in *France* thus (a). "Whereas the Word "of God is the ſumm of all Truth, containing whatſoever is requiſite "to the Worſhip of God and our Salvation; we affirm that it is not law-"ful for Men or Angels either to add any thing to it, or take away any "thing from it, nor to change any thing at all therein; from whence it "follows, that it is not lawful to ſet, either Antiquity, or Cuſtom, or a "Multitude, or Humane Wiſdom, Opinions, Decrees, Councils, or "Viſions, or Miracles, in oppoſition to Divine Scripture; but rather "that all things ought to be examined and tried according to this Rule, "and what is preſcribed therein.

(a) Quum Verbum Dei ſit omnis veritatis ſumma, complectens quicquid ad cultum Dei & ſalutem noſtram requiritur, neq; hominibus, neque ipſis etiam Angelis fas eſſe dicimus quicquam ei verbo adjicere, vel detrahere, vel quicquam prorſus in eo immutare: Ex hoc autem efficitur, neque antiquitatem, conſuetudines, neq; multitudinem, neq; Humanam Sapientiam, neq; Judicia, neq; Edicta vel Decreta ulla, neq; Concilia, neq; Viſiones, neq; Miracula, Scripturæ illi Divinæ opponere licere: Sed potius omnia ad ejus regulam & præſcriptum examinari & exigi oportere, *Gallic. Confeſ. in Syntag. Confeſ. p.* 78.

The *Belgick* Confeſſion thus (b). "We believe that the Holy Scrip-"ture doth perfectly contain the Will of God, and that whatſoever is "neceſſary to be believed by men, for the obtaining of Salvation, is "ſufficiently taught therein.——For when it is forbidden that any "ſhould add to it, or take away from it, thereby is abundantly de-"monſtrated, that the Doctrine thereof is moſt perfect, and every "way compleat.

(b) Credimus ſacram hanc Scripturam, Dei voluntatem perfectè complecti, & quodcunq; ab hominibus, ut ſalutem conſequantur, credi neceſſe eſt, in illa ſufficienter edoceri.—Quum enim vetitum ſit, ne quis Dei verbo quicquam addat, aut detrahat, ſatis eo ipſo demonſtratur, Doctrinam illius perfectiſſimam, omnibuſque modis conſummatam eſſe. *Belg. Eccleſ. Confeſ. Syntag. p.* 131.

Wittember. Confeſ. (c) "That all Doctrine neceſſary to be known "by us in order to true and eternal Salvation is not contained in the "Scripture is ſooner ſaid than proved. To add no more, by theſe it is evident that in this point the Reformed Churches do not only agree among themſelves, but alſo with the Prophets and Apoſtles, teaching herein the ſame Doctrine that Chriſt and they did, which was the thing to be proved.

(c) In hac Scriptura non contineri omnem Doctrinam, nobis ad veram & perpetuam ſalutem cognitu neceſſariam,

——videtur facilius poſſe dici, quàm probari. *wittemb. Confeſ. Syntag. pag.* 130.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning the Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture.

The *Council of Trent* declared (d), "That the Doctrine of the Go-

(d) Sacroſancta—Tridentina ſynodus—perſpiciens hanc veritatem [Evangelii] & diſciplinam contineri in libris Scriptis, & ſine Scripto Traditionibus.——Omnes libros tam veteris quam Novi Teſtamenti,——Nec non Traditiones ipſas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes,——pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ ſuſcipit & veneratur. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 4.

"ſpel is contained in the Written Word, and in Unwritten Traditions, "and that they did receive and honour the Unwritten Traditions, whe-"ther appertaining to Faith, or Manners, with the ſame reverence and "holy affection, as they did all the Books of the Old and New Teſta-"ment.

The *Canon Law* ſaith (*e*), "That men do with ſuch reverence re-"ſpect the Apoſtolical Seat of *Rome*, that they rather deſire to know the "ancient Inſtitution of Chriſtian Religion from the Popes mouth, than "from the holy Scripture; and they only enquire what is his pleaſure, "and according to it, they order their Life and Converſation. Again, "(*f*) that the [Popes] *Decretal Epiſtles are to be numbred with Canonical* "*Scripture.*

(*e*) Et revera tantâ reverentiâ apicem præfatæ Apoſtolicæ ſedis omnes ſuſpiciunt. — Ut antiquam Chriſtianæ Religionis inſtitutionem magis ab ore præceſſoris ejus, quam à ſacris paginis, & paternis Traditionibus expetant: illius velle, illius nolle tantum explorant, ut ad ejus arbitrium ſuam converſationem & ipſi remittant, aut intendant. *Corp. jur. Canon. Diſt.* 40. *ſi Papa in Annot.*

(*f*) Inter Canonicas Scripturas Decretales Epiſtolæ connumerantur. *Corp. juris Canon. Diſt.* 19. *cap.* 6.

Dr. *Standiſh* in his Book againſt *Engliſh* Bibles ſaith, "Take from "them the *Engliſh* damnable Tranſlations, and let them learn to give "as much credit, to that which is not expreſſed, as to that which is "expreſſed in the Scripture.

(*g*) *Melchior Canus* writeth, "That many things belong to Chriſtian "Faith and Doctrine, which are neither plainly nor obſcurely contained "in holy Scripture. And he doth give particular Inſtances, "That "the help of the holy Martyrs ſhould be craved by Prayer, and their "Memories celebrated, and their Images worſhipped, and ſuch-like, is "not taught in the holy Scripture, and yet the Catholick Church doth "as firmly hold theſe and many ſuch-like Doctrines as if they were writ-"ten in holy Scripture.-----Again he ſays, "There is more efficacy for "confutation of Hereticks in Tradition, than in Scripture.-----Again, "Almoſt all Diſputations with Hereticks ſhould be referred to the Tra-"ditions received from our fore-fathers.

(*g*) Multa pertinere [docet] ad Chriſtianorum fidem & Doctrinam quæ nec apertè, nec obſcurè, in ſacris literis continentur. — Sanctorum Martyrum auxilium precibus implorandum, eorumque memorias celebrandas, Imagines venerandas eſſe, in Sacrificio Euchariſtiæ ſimul cum corpore ſanguinem ſacerdotibus eſſe, & conficiendum, & ſumendum, *&c.* Sacræ literæ nuſquam fortè tradiderunt. At ejuſmodi atq; alia pleraq; id genus, ita firmiter Eccleſia Catholica retinet, ut ſi ſacris codicibus ſuiſſent inſcripta: *Melch. Can. loc. Theolog. Lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. Adde, quod ad confutandos Hæreticos major vis in Traditione, quàm in Scriptura eſt. — Quorſum hæc tam longo Sermone repetita? Nempe ut intelligas, non modò adverſum hæreticos plus habere Traditionem, quàm Scripturam virium, ſed etiam omnem fermè cum hæreticis diſputationem ad Traditiones à majoribus acceptas eſſe referendam: *Ibid.*

(*b*) Multòque maxima pars Evangelii pervenit ad nos Traditione, perexi[illegible] literis eſt Mandata. *Hoſius confeſſ. Fid. Cathol. cap.* 92. *pag.* 133. *fol.*

(*b*) Cardinal *Hoſius* ſpeaks out, ſaying, "The greateſt part of the

"Goſpel

"Gospel is come to us by Tradition, very little of it is committed to "Writing.

By this, Reader, thou maist plainly perceive that the Doctrine of the Papists in this, is expresly contrary to the Doctrine of the Prophets, Christ, and his Apostles, and that the Doctrine of the Protestants is the very same with the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles: compare them together, and thou will see the agreement of the one, and the contrariety of the other, to the Doctrine of Scripture, and conclude that the Doctrine of the Reformed Church is the *old and true*, but the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, is both *new and false* Doctrine; And that what the *Rhemists* on *Gal.* 1. 8. say, *It is great pity and shame that so many follow* Luther *and* Calvin, and *such other lewd Fellows into a new Gospel*; is more true of, and better applied to the followers of the Popish Doctors, or of the *Rhemists* themselves; who on 2 *Tim.* 3, 16. say, *The Hereticks upon this commendation of holy Scriptures, pretend (very simply in good sooth) that therefore nothing is necessary to Justice and Salvation but Scriptures.* And on *Joh.* 21. 25. *Few things are written of Christs Acts and Doctrine in comparison of that which he did and spake, and yet the Hereticks will needs have all in Scripture.* Whereas the Evangelist saith not, That any thing is omitted of his Doctrine, but of his Acts: For though he spake more words than be expressed, yet all the Doctrines that he uttered in those words, is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The Apostles preached nothing but that which was contained in the Scriptures, *Act.* 17. 11. *&* 26. 22. *Rom.* 1. 2. *Fulk in loc.* *

II. *Of Reading of the Scripture.*

I. The Doctrine of the Prophets, Christ, and Apostles concerning the common Peoples reading and knowing of the Scripture.

Deut. 31. 12, *Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this Law.* 13. *And that their children which have not known any thing, may hear and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the Land.* Josh. 8. 35. *There was not a word of all that* Moses *commanded, which* Joshua *read not before all the Congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them.* Psal. 1. 2. *His delight is in the Law of the Lord, and in his Law doth he meditate day and night.* Act. 8. 28.----*Was returning and sitting in his Chariot read* Isaias *the Prophet.* Joh. 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testifie of me.* Act. 17. 11. *And these were more noble than those in* Thessalonica, *in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.* Ephes. 3. 4. *Whereby when ye read, ye may understand*

derſtand my knowledg in the myſtery of Chriſt. Col. 3. 16. *Let the word of God dwell in you richly in all wiſdom:* 1 Theſ. 5. 27. *I charge you by the Lord that this Epiſtle be read unto all the holy Brethren.* 2 Tim. 3. 15: *And that from a child thou haſt known the holy Scriptures.*------Rev. 1. 3. *Bleſſed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this Prophesie, and keep thoſe things that are written therein.*

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants and Reformed Churches concerning the Peoples reading and knowing of the Scriptures.

"Becauſe the Original Tongues are not known to all the People of "God, who have right unto, and intereſt in the Scriptures, and are "commanded in the fear of God to read and ſearch them, therefore they "are to be Tranſlated.--------All ſorts of People are bound to read it [The Word of God] apart by themſelves, and with their Families.----- -----(i) "It is lawful for all men privately at home to read the holy "Scriptures, and by Inſtructions to edifie one another in the true Religion.-------

(i) Omnibus ſacras literas privatim legere domi, & inſtruendo ædificare mutuum in vera Religione liceat. *Confeſ. Helvet. cap.* 22.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning the Peoples having, or reading of the Scripture.

(k) "Whereas experience teacheth, that if the Bible be every-where "without difference, permitted in the vulgar Tongue, through mens "unadviſedneſs, more hurt than good doth ariſe thereby, in this point "let the judgment of the Biſhop, or Inquiſitor be followed; that with "the advice of the Pariſh-Prieſt, or Confeſſor, they may grant the read- "ding of the Bible, Tranſlated by Catholick Authors, in the vulgar "language, to ſuch as they ſhall underſtand, can take no hurt by ſuch "reading, but increaſe of Faith and Godlineſs. The which Licenſe let "them have in writing. And if any preſume without ſuch Licenſe ei- "ther to read or have it, unleſs they firſt deliver up their Bibles to the "Ordinary, they may not have the pardon of their ſins. And the Book- "ſellers, that without ſuch Licenſe, ſhall ſell, or any way afford Bibles "in the vulgar Language, ſhall forfeit the price of the Books, to be "converted by the Biſhop to pious uſes, and be liable to ſuch other pe- "nalties according to the quality of the offence, as the Biſhop ſhall "think meet.

(k) Cum experimento manifeſtum ſit, ſi ſacra Biblia vulgari lingua paſſim ſine diſcrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parte judicio Epiſcopi, aut Inquiſitoris ſtetur, * ut cum conſilio Parochi, vel confeſſorii, Bibliorum, à Catholicis auctoribus verſorum, lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere poſſint, quos intellexerint, ex hujuſmodi lectione non damnum, ſed fidei atq; pietatis augmentum capere poſſe, quam facultatem in Scriptis habeant. Qui autem abſq; tali facultate ea legere, aut habere, præſumpſerint, niſi prius Bibliis Ordinario redditis, peccatorum abſolutionem percipere non poſſint. Bibliopolæ verò, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti, Biblia Idiomate vulgari conſcripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo conceſſerint, librorum pretium, in uſus pios ab Epiſcopo convertendum, amittant, aliiſque pœnis pro delicti qualitate ejuſdem Epiſcopi arbitrio ſubjaceant. *Index. Lib. prohib. Regul.* 4.

Though

Though this is not agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ and his Apoſtles that men muſt not read the Scripture without a Licenſe from men, for ſo what is ſtrictly commanded by God, would be at the pleaſure of others, whether God be obeyed or no, and ſome liberty by Pope *Pius* the Fourth doth ſeem to be granted for the reading of the Bible, to whom they pleaſe, yet it is taken away fully by Pope *Clement* the Eighth, in his Obſervation of this before alledged Rule, in theſe words.

(l) "It is to be obſerved concerning this Rule of *Pius* the Fourth, "that by this Impreſſion and Edition, no new Power is granted to Biſhops, or Inquiſitors, or Superiors, to licenſe the buying, reading, "or keeping the Bible in the vulgar Tongue, ſeeing hitherto by the "command and practice of the holy *Roman*, and Univerſal Inquiſition, "the power of granting ſuch Licenſes, to read or keep Bibles in the "vulgar Language, or any parts of the holy Scripture, as well of the "New as of the Old Teſtament, or any ſums or Hiſtorical Abridgments "of the ſame, in any vulgar Language, hath been taken from them; "which inviolably is to be obſerved.

(l) Animadvertendum eſt circa ſupra ſcriptam quartam Regulam Indicis *Pii Papæ* IV. nullam per hanc Impreſſionem & Editionem de novo tribui facultatem Epiſcopis, vel Inquiſitoribus, aut Regularium Superioribus, concedendi Licentiam emendi, legendi, aut retinendi Biblia vulgari Lingua edita, cum hactenus mandato & uſu ſanctæ Romanæ & univerſalis Inquiſitionis ſublata eis fuerit facultas concedendi hujuſmodi Licentias legendi, vel retinendi Biblia vulgaria, aut alias Sacræ Scripturæ tam novi, quam veteris Teſtamenti partes quavis vulgari Lingua editas: ac inſuper ſummaria & compendia etiam Hiſtorica eorundum Bibliorum, ſeu Librorum Sacræ Scripturæ, quocunque vulgari Idiomate conſcripta: quod quidem inviolate ſervandum eſt. *Ind. Lib. prohib. Obſervat. circa Reg.* 4.

(m) Cardinal *Bellarmine* to the ſame purpoſe teacheth, "That the "People would get not only no good but much hurt from the Scriptures; for they would eaſily take occaſion of erring, both in Doctrines of Faith, and in Precepts concerning Life and Manners.

(m) Populus non ſolum non caperet fructum ex Scripturis, ſed etiam caperet detrimentum: Acciperet enim facillimè occaſionem errandi, tum in Doctrina fidei, tum in præceptis vitæ & morum. *Bellar. de Verb. Dei. Lib.* 2. *cap.* 15.

Pereſius (quoted by Dr. *White*) ſaith, "Shall no bounds be ſet to popular, rude, and carnal men? Shall old men, before they have put off "the filth of their mind, and young men that yet ſpeak like children, be "admitted to read the Scripture? I ſuppoſe verily (and my opinion "fails me not) this Ordinance under the pretence of Piety, was invented by the Devil.

The *Rhemiſts* Tranſlators in their Preface write in theſe words. "Which Tranſlation we do not publiſh upon Erroneous opinion of neceſſity, that the holy Scriptures ſhould always be in our Mother-"tongue, or that they ought, or were ordained of God to be read indifferently of all.------Or that we generally and abſolutely deemed it "more convenient in it ſelf, and more agreeable to Gods Word and "Honour, or edification of the Faith to have them turned into vulgar "Tongues

"Tongues, than to be kept and ſtudied only in the Eccleſiaſtical learned "Languages.----The wiſe will not regard what ſome wilful People do "mutter, That the Scriptures are made for all men; and that it is of "envy that the Prieſts do keep the holy Book from them: Which ſug-"geſtion cometh of the ſame Serpent that ſeduced our firſt Parents, who "perſwaded them that God had forbidden them that tree of Knowledg, "leſt they ſhould be as cunning as himſelf, and like unto the Higheſt. "No, no, the Church doth it to keep them from blind ignorant pre-"ſumption, and from that which the Apoſtle calls, Knowledg, falſly ſo "called, and not to bar them from the true Knowledg of Chriſt.---- "She knoweth how to do it without caſting the holy to Dogs, or "pearls to Hogs.

Bravely ſaid! O the excellent art of the Mother-Church, that by keeping of her Sons and Daughters ignorant of the Word of God (the means of Knowledg) keeps them from blindneſs and ignorance! Who ever thought that to keep People in ignorance had been the way to keep them from it? What pretty conceit is this that they bar the People from knowing the Scripture, and yet do not bar them from the Knowledg of Chriſt? When Chriſt bids us *Search the Scriptures, for they are they that teſtifie of him.*

III. *Of Religious Worſhip in a known Tongue.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture concerning this Point.

1 Cor. 14. 2. *He that ſpeaketh in an unknown tongue ſpeaketh not to men, but to God, for no man underſtandeth him; howbeit in the ſpirit he ſpeaketh myſteries.* Read ver. 3,4,5,6,7,8,----9. *So likewiſe ye except ye utter by the tongue words eaſie to be underſtood, how ſhall it be known what is ſpoken? for ye ſhall ſpeak unto the air.* v. 11. *If I know not the meaning of the voice, I ſhall be to him that ſpeaketh a Barbarian, and he that ſpeaketh ſhall be a Barbarian unto me.* 14. *For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my ſpirit prayeth, but my underſtanding is unfruitful.* 16. *Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſs with the ſpirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, ſay Amen, at thy giving of thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt.* 18. *I thank my God I ſpeak with tongues more than you all.* 19. *Yet in the Church I had rather ſpeak five words with my underſtanding, that by my voice I might teach others alſo, than ten thouſand words in an unknown tongue.* Read alſo *ver.* 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28.

II. The Doctrine of the Reformed Churches concerning Religious Worſhip in a known Tongue.

(*n*) Ang. Artic. 24. (*n*) "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the "cuſtom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, "or to miniſter Sacraments in a Tongue not underſtood by the "People.

(*o*) Becauſe

(o) "Because the Original Tongues are not known to all the Peo- "ple, who have right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are com- "manded in the fear of God to read and search them; therefore they are "to be Translated into the vulgar Language of every Nation unto "which they come, that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, "they might Worship him in an acceptable manner.------ (o) Assemb. Confes.

(p) "Let all things in the Church be done decently and in order, fi- "nally let all things be done to edification; therefore let all strange "Tongues keep silence in the holy Assemblies; let all things be utter- "ed in the vulgar Tongue, which is understood of all men in the com- "pany. (p) Omnia decenter & ordine fiant in Ecclesia, omnia deniq; fiant ad ædificationem, taceant ergo omnes peregrinæ linguæ in cætibus sacris: omnia proponantur lingua vulgari, quæ eo in loco ab hominibus in cætu intelligatur. *Confes. Helvet. cap.* 22.

(q) "Contrary to the expres's command of the Holy Ghost, in the "Church all things are said and sung in a language which the People do "not understand. (q) Contra expressum spiritus sancti præceptum, in eâ omnia dicuntur & canuntur linguâ, quam populus non intelligit. *Confes. Argentinens. cap.* 21.

(r) "What hath been already said concerning the use of a Language "known to the common People, is to be understood not only in singing "of Psalms, but also of all the parts of the Ecclesiastical Ministry; "for as Sermons and Prayers ought to be in a Tongue known unto the "Church, so also should the Sacraments be dispensed in a known Lan- "guage; for though it be lawful for the sake of the Learned sometimes "to use a strange Tongue, yet the consent of the Universal Church re- "quires [proves this] that the necessary services of the Church should "be done in the Mother-tongue. (r) Quod jam dictum est de usu Linguæ vulgo notæ, intelligendum est non tantum de cantu Psalmorum, sed etiam de omnibus partibus Ecclesiastici Ministerii. Sicut enim conciones & precationes linguâ Ecclesiæ notâ habendæ sunt, ita & Sacramenta noto Sermone dispensanda sunt. Etsi enim licebit aliquoties peregrinâ linguâ propter studiosos uti, tamen consensus Catholicæ Ecclesiæ hoc exigit, ut necessaria Ministeria Ecclesiæ fiant Sermone vernaculo. *Confes. Wittemb. de horis Canon.*

(s) "Our [Ministers] use all diligent endeavours that they may "teach in the Church and preach the Word of the Gospel, without "mixture of Humane Traditions; do read the very Gospels and other "Scriptures in the Churches in the vulgar Tongue, and after do inter- "pret them to the People. (s) Nostri omnem operam navant, ut verbum Evangelii, impermixtum Humanis Traditionibus, in Ecclesia doceant ac prædicent; proinde ipsa Evangelia, necnon alias Scripturas, Lingua vulgari in Templis legunt; ac ita demum populo interpretantur. *Confes. Bohemic. Artic.* 10.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning publick Religious Worship in a known Tongue.

(t) Etsi Missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem: non tamen expedire visum est Patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 22.

(t) "Although the Mass containeth much instruction of the People, "yet the Fathers thought it not expedient that it should be every-"where celebrated in the vulgar Tongue.

(u) Experientiâ Magistrâ didicimus quid fructus ea res attulerit, quod in plerisque locis Officia Divina, in linguam vernaculam ad verbum translata decantentur. Tantum abest, ut accesserit ad Pietatem aliquid plus, ut etiam diminutum esse videatur. *Hosius de Sacro vernaculè Legendo.*

(u) "Experience teaching us we have learned, what hath been the "fruit of this, that Divine Service in many places Translated into the "Mother-tongue, is said, It is so far that Piety should be encreased, that "it is much diminished thereby.

The *Rhemists* Divines on 1 *Cor.* 14. thus: "We do not doubt but "it is acceptable to God, and available in all necessities, and more a-"greeable to the use of all Christian People ever since their Conversion "to pray in *Latin*, than in the Vulgar, though every one in particular "understandeth not what he saith: So it is plain that such pray with as "great consolation of spirit, with as little tediousness, with as great "devotion and affection, and sometimes more than the other, (such of "their own Church that learn their *Pater-Noster* in their vulgar Tongue) "and always more than any Schismatick or Heretick [Protestants] in "his own Language.--------There is a Reverence and Majesty in the "Churches Tongue dedicated in our Saviours Cross, and giveth more "force and valour to them [Prayers] said in the Churches obedience, "than to others.-----The special use of them [Prayers] is to offer our "hearts, desires and wants to God, and to shew that we hang on him "in all things, and this every Catholick doth for his condition, whether "he understand the words of his Prayer or not.------It is enough that "they can tell, this holy Orison to be appointed to us, to call upon God "in all our desires, more than this is not necessary; and the Translati-"on of such holy things often breedeth manifold danger and irreve-"rence in the Vulgar (as to think God is the Author of Sin, when they "read *Lead us not into temptation*) and seldom any edification at all. To "conclude, for praying either publickly or privately in *Latin*, which is "the common Sacred Tongue of the greatest part of the Christian "World, this is thought by the wisest and godliest to be most expedi-"ent, and is certainly seen to be nothing repugnant to St. *Paul.*

Reader, View over again 1 *Cor.* 14. and wonder at this Popish in-solence, to say, This is nothing repugnant to St. *Paul.*

IV. *Of the Authority of the Scripture.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apostles concerning the Authority of the Scripture

Scripture, that it doth not depend upon the Teſtimony of Men.

2 Pet. 1. 19. *We have alſo a more ſure word of Propheſie, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that ſhineth in a dark place.*---- 21. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the holy Ghoſt.* 2 Tim. 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by inſpiration from God.*------1 Joh. 5. 9. *If we receive the witneſs of men, the witneſs of God is greater.* 1 Theſ. 2. 13. *Ye received the word of God which ye heard of us,*-----*not as the word of men, but as (it is in truth) the word of God.*----

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants, or Reformed Churches concerning the Authority of the Scripture.

(w) "The Authority of holy Scripture, for which it ought to be "believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the Teſtimony of any Man "or Church, but wholly upon God (who is truth it ſelf) the Author "thereof; and therefore it is to be received becauſe it is the Word of "God.

(w) Aſſemb. Confeſſ.

(x) "We believe without wavering all things which are contained "in the Scriptures, not ſo much becauſe the Church alloweth and re- "ceiveth them for Canonical, as for that the Holy Ghoſt beareth wit- "neſs to our Conſciences that they come from God, and have proof "thereof in themſelves.

(x) Omnia quæ Canonicis libris continentur, abſq; omni dubitatione credimus; idque non tam, quod Eccleſia eos pro hujuſmodi recipiat & approbet, quam imprimis quod Spiritus ſanctus in cordibus noſtris teſtetur à Deo perfectos eſſe, comprobationemq, ejus in ſeipſis habeant. *Confeſſ. Belg. Artic.* 5.

(y) "We believe and confeſs that the Canonical Scriptures of the "Prophets and Apoſtles, of Old and New Teſtament, be the true "Word of God, and have ſufficient Authority from themſelves, and "not from men; for God himſelf ſpake unto the Fathers, Prophets "and Apoſtles, and doth yet ſpeak unto us by the holy Scriptures.

(y) Credimus & confitemur Scripturas Canonicas ſanctorum Prophetarum & Apoſtolorum utriuſq; Teſtamenti ipſum verum eſſe Verbum Dei: & authoritatem ſufficientem ex ſemetipſis, non ex hominibus habere. Nam Deus ipſe loquutus eſt Patribus, Prophetis & Apoſtolis, & loquitur adhuc nobis per Scripturas ſanctas. *Confeſ. Helvet. cap.* 1.

(z) "We acknowledg theſe Books to be Canonical, that is, we re- "ceive them as the Rule of our Faith, and that not only from the com- "mon conſent of the Church, but much rather from the Teſtimony and "inward perſwaſion of the holy Spirit.-----

(z) Hos libros agnoſcimus eſſe Canonicos, id, eſt, ut fidei noſtræ normam & Regulam habemus; idq; non tantum ex communi Eccleſiæ conſenſu, ſed etiam multo magis ex Teſtimonio, & intrinſeca Spiritus ſancti perſuaſione. ——— *Confeſſ. Gallic. Art.* 4.

"As we do believe and confeſs that the Word of God doth ſuf- "ficiently inſtruct, and make the man of God perfect. So we do affirm "and freely profeſs, that its Authority is from God, and doth not de-

"pend upon Men or Angels. We therefore aſſert, that they which ſay, "The Scripture hath no other Authority, but what it receiveth from "the Church; are Blaſphemers againſt God, and wrong the true "Church, which always heareth and obeyeth the voice of her Bride-"groom and Paſtor, but never challengeth to her ſelf a power to be "the Miſtreſs over it. (a)

(a) Sicut credimus & confitemur Scripturas Dei ſufficienter inſtruere, & hominem Dei perfectum reddere ita, ejus authoritatem à Deo eſſe, & nec ab homine vel Angelo pendere affirmamus & profitemur. Aſſerimus itaq; quod qui dicunt Scripturam non aliam habere authoritatem, ſed eam quam ab Eccleſia accepit, ſunt in Deum blaſphemi, & veræ Eccleſiæ injuriam faciunt, quæ ſemper audit, & voci ſponſi & Paſtoris ſui obſequitur, nunquam autem magiſtram agere ſibi arrogat. *Confeſſ. Scotican. Art.* 19.

(b) "Foraſmuch as the holy Scriptures were given and inſpired by "God himſelf, [for this cauſe eſpecially] that they might be underſtood "of all, they are read in our Churches in the vulgar Tongue.——

(b) Quòd à Deo ipſo —— Sacræ Scripturæ traditæ & inſpiratæ, Hancq; ob cauſam potiſſimùm, ut ab omnibus intelligantur, eas Eccleſiis noſtris, lingua vulgari, —— [noſtri omnes] Legunt & recitant.—— *Confeſſ. Bohemic. Art.* 1.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning the Authority of the Scripture.

(c) Cardinal *Hoſius* Preſident in the Council of *Trent*, ſaith, "To "ask, Whether more credit ſhould be given to the Scripture or the "Church? is to ask, Whether more credit ſhould be given to the Holy "Ghoſt, ſpeaking by the mouth of the Church, or to the Holy Ghoſt "ſpeaking in the Scripture by the Writings of the Prophets and Apo-"ſtles.——The Church is to be believed without the Authority of the "Scriptures.——If Authority be not granted to the Teſtimony of the "Church, the Writings of the Evangeliſts would be of no Authority.

(c) Creditum eſt Eccleſiæ ſine omni Scripturarum præſidio. —— Teſtimonio Eccleſiæ ſi non ſua tribuetur authoritas, nulla erit eorum, quæ Scripta ſunt ab Evangeliſtis authoritas. *Hoſius Confeſſ. Fid. Cath. cap.* 15.

Hermanus ſpeaks moſt contemptuouſly of the holy Scriptures inſpired by the glorious God, ſaying, "When the Authority of the Church "leaveth the Scriptures, they then are of no more account than *Æſops* "*Fables.*

(d) *Pighius* treads in the ſteps of the reſt, concluding, "That all the "Authority which the Scripture hath with us, dependeth of neceſſity "on the Church.

(d) *Pigh. de Hierar. Lib.* 1. *cap.* 2.

(e) And ſo doth *Canus* aſſerting, "That we are not bound to take "the Scriptures for Scripture without the Authority of the Church. "And ſo do many more, whoſe ſayings we have not room to inſert.

(e) *Melch. Canus. loc. com. lib.* 2. *cap.* 8.

V. *Of*

V. *Of the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scriptures.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles concerning the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scriptures.

Mat. 22.29. *Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto them* (in the Controverſie about the Reſurrection) *ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.* 31. *But as touching the Reſurrection of the Dead, have ye not* READ *that which was ſpoken unto you by God, ſaying,* 32. *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* Act. 18.28. *For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, ſhewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was the Chriſt.* Act. 17.2. *And Paul as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reaſoned with them out of the Scriptures.* 3. *Opening and alledging that the Chriſt muſt needs have ſuffered, and riſen again from the dead, and that this Jeſus whom I preach unto you is the Chriſt.* See *Acts* 26. 22. & 13. 33.

The Apoſtle teacheth that the Scripture muſt not be expounded according to any private interpretation, 1 *Pet.* 1.20. and ſuch is any Expoſition that is not according to the Analogy of Faith, which muſt be carefully heeded in Scripture-interpretation, according to the Apoſtles Doctrine, *Rom.* 12. 6.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants and Reformed Churches concerning the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scripture.

(*f*) " The Supream Judg by which all Controverſies of Religion " are to be determined, and all Decrees of Councils, opinions of ancient " Writers, Doctrines of Men and private Spirits are to be examined, " and in whoſe ſentence we are to reſt, can be no other but the holy " Spirit ſpeaking in the Scripture. (*f*) Aſſemb. Confeſſ.

(*g*) " We hold no other Judg in matters of Faith than God himſelf, " declaring by the holy Scriptures what is true, and what is falſe, what " ought to be embraced, and what to be avoided. (*g*) Confeſſ. Helvet. *cap.* 2.

(*h*) " The Infallible Rule of Interpretation of Scripture is the Scrip- " ture it ſelf, and therefore when there is a Queſtion about the true and " full ſenſe of any Scripture, it muſt be ſearched and known by other " places of Scripture that ſpeak more clearly. (*h*) Aſſemb. Confeſſ. (*i*) Confeſſ. Scotican. Art. 18. de notis Eccleſiæ.

(*i*) " We acknowledg that Interpretation of Scripture only to be " orthodox and genuine, which is fetcht from the Scriptures them- " ſelves. So other Churches in their Confeſſions. (*k*) (*k*) Confeſſ. Helvet. cap. 2. Confeſſ. Wittemberg. de ſacra Scriptura, & de Eccleſia.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scripture.

(*l*) The Council of *Trent* decreed, " That none ſhould interpret the (*l*) Nemo Sacras Scripturas contra eum ſenſum, quem tenuit, & tenet ſancta mater Eccleſia, cujus eſt judicare de vero ſenſu & interpretatione Scripturarum ſanctarum —— interpretari audeat. *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 4.

"holy Scripture contrary to the meaning which the holy Mother-"Church, (to whom it doth belong to judg of the true ſence and inter-"pretation of Scripture) hath held and doth hold.-----

(m) Corpus jur. Can. Diſt. 19. c. enimvero.

(m) "For as much as the holy Church of *Rome*------is ſet up to the "whole world for a glaſs or example, whatſoever ſhe determineth or "ordaineth, ought by all perpetually and invincibly to be obſerved. So their Canon Law.

Others of them to the ſame purpoſe: "All power to interpret Scri-"pture, and reveal the hidden Myſteries of our Religion, is given "from Heaven to the Popes and their Councils. We are bound to ſtand "to the judgment of the Pope, rather than to the judgment of all the "World beſides.

"We do conſtantly avouch all the Popes that are rightly elected to "be Chriſts Vicars,-----and to have the higheſt power in the Catholick "Church, and that we are bound to obey him in all things pertaining "to Faith and Religion:------All Catholick men muſt neceſſarily ſubmit "their judgment and opinions, either in expounding the Scripture, or "otherwiſe to the cenſure of the Apoſtolick Seat; and God hath bound "his Church to hear the chief Paſtor in all Points. [Thus *Andradius*, *Alvarus Pelagius*, *Simancha*. *Whites* way to the Church, *p.*37.]

Bellarmine ſticks ſo cloſe to the judgment of the Pope, that he had as good ſay, That if the Pope ſay that black is white, or white black, that darkneſs is light, or that light is darkneſs, we muſt believe it, becauſe his Infallible Holineſs ſaith it, as ſay what he doth in theſe words.

(n) To prove the Pope cannot err, he uſeth this *Argument*. Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitio, prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Eccleſia credere vitia eſſe bona, & virtutes malas, niſi vellet contra conſcientiam peccare——ac ne forte contra conſcientiam agat, tenetur credere bonum eſſe quod ille præcipit, malum quod ille prohibet. *Bell. de Pont. lib.*4. *cap.*5.

(n) "If the Pope did err commanding Vices and forbidding Virtues, "the Church ſhould be bound to believe, that Vices are good, and "Virtues evil, unleſs ſhe would ſin againſt conſcience.

Is not this a notable ſaying, ſpoken like a Cardinal?

(o) *Stapleton* advancing the judgment of the Church, ſpeaks reſolvedly; "I have ſaid, and do ſay that Scripture in it ſelf is not ſo much "the Rule of Faith, as the Faith of the Church is the Rule of Scripture.

(o) *Staplet.* de autorit. Scrip. lib.2. cap.11.

(p) Gregor.de valent.Analyſ. fidei, lib.8.c.1.

(p) And *Gregory* of *Valence* puts in his ſaying for the Popes judgment. "In the *Roman* Biſhop reſideth that full Authority of the Church, when "he pleaſeth to determine matters of Faith, whether he doth it with a "Council, or without.

(q) Corpus Juris Can. Diſtinct. 40. Si Papa, *&c.*

Yea, the *Canon-Law* ſets him up for ſuch an uncontroulable Judg, "That if the Pope by his negligence or remiſsneſs in his work, (q) be "found unprofitable to himſelf or others; or if he ſhould draw with him "innumerable Souls by heaps or troops to hell, yet might no mortal "man be ſo bold or preſumptuous to reprove him, becauſe he is the "Judg of all, to be judged by none.-----

VI. *Of*

VI. *Of the Head of the Universal Church.*

I. The Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles concerning the Head of the Universal Church.

Mat. 23. 8. *But be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master even Christ, and all ye are brethren.* Ephes. 1. 22. *And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church.* 23. *Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.* Ephes. 5. 23. *Christ is the head of the Church, and he is the Saviour of the body.* Col. 1. 18. *And he* (Christ) *is the head of the body, the Church.* 1 Cor. 12. 28. *And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, &c.* Ephes. 4. 11. *And he gave some Apostles, and some Pastors and Teachers.*

Reader, observe in these places where the Apostle gives an Enumeration of Church-Officers, here is no mention of a Vicar of Christ, or of any mortal man being the Head under Christ, of all the Churches of Christ in the World, and is it likely that he would have omitted the chiefest and most principal Officer, that is essential to the Church, if there had been any such? I can find several Officers mentioned, but no Universal (though secondary) Head, if I have over-looked him, and thou findest any such, do me the kindness to come, or send, and tell me that thou hast found him in the Apostles Catalogue; which I could not see mentioned neither *expressly*, nor *reductively*; not expressly, that is plain; not reductively, for to which of these should he be reduced? to the Prophets? let me hear his Prophesies, and when any of them have been fulfilled: Besides, I know not that he pretends thereto. To be an Apostle? Apostles went up and down to preach the Gospel, and were not fixed to any particular State, which is not the case of the Bishop of *Rome*. To the number of Teachers, and Pastors? this is below the Pope to be ranked amongst such, for he is the Pastor of Pastors. Besides in the Catalogue there are many Pastors, but I see not one to be the chief and head of all the rest, and of the whole Universal Church. So that in the Catalogue of the Apostles there is no such thing, but is a *non-ens*, a meer *Chimæra*, a fiction.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants, or Reformed Churches concerning the Head of the Universal Church.

"There is no other Head of the Church, but the Lord Jesus Christ, "nor can the Pope of *Rome* in any sense be Head thereof; all true Pa"stors in what place soever they be placed, have the same and equal "Authority among themselves, given unto them under Jesus Christ, the "only Head, and the chief, and alone Universal Bishop: And there"fore it is not lawful for any Church to challenge unto it self, Domi-

"nion.

"nion or Soveraignty over any other Church.----The Bishop of *Rome* "hath no more Jurisdiction over the Church of God, than the rest of "the Patriarchs, either of *Alexandria* or *Antioch* have.

(r) Confess. Helvet. cap. 17. Confess. Scoticana Art. 16. de Ecclesia. Confess. Belgic. Art. 29. Confess. Wittemb. de summo Pontifice. Confess. Bohemic. Art. 8.

To this Doctrine (r) subscribe the Churches of *Helvetia*, *Scotland*, *Belgia*, *Wittemberg*, *Bohemia*, *&c.*

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning the Head of the Church.

(s) Corpus, Juris Can. Decret. part. 2. Q. 7. cap. Beati. distinct. 22. c. Romana Ecclesia cæterarum primatum habet. & glos. distinct. 22. c. Non. & glos. Sacrosancta. Distin. 21. c. quamvis. ibid. c. Deniq; distinct. 19. c. enimvero. Distin. 22. c. omnes. Distin. 81. P. Greg. 7. c. si qui.

(s) "The *Canon Law* makes the Church of *Rome* higher than all o- "thers by the Head; affirming the Church of *Rome* to be the Head and "Prince of all Nations; the mother of Faith; that it had this Headship "not from the Apostles but from the Lord himself, and hath the emi- "nency of power over the Universal Church, and the whole flock of "Christian people, the Hinge and Head of all Churches; as the door "doth turn upon the Hinges, so all Churches by Gods appointment (but where I wonder) "are governed by the Authority of this holy "Seat; the first of all other Seats, without spot or blemish, or any such "thing. [Thats a loud one.] The Mistress of all other Churches, a "glass and spectacle unto all men, to be followed in all things she ap- "pointeth. "Against which Church of *Rome* whosoever speaketh any "evil, or endeavours to take away her Priviledg is forthwith an Here- "tick; and whoso shall refuse obedience to the Apostolick Seat, is an "Idolater, a Witch, and Pagan.

Reader, these are high and swelling words, but the best on 'tis, it i sfalse Doctrine.

(t) Catechis. Trident. in Expos. Symb. Apost.

(t) The *Roman Catechism* propounds the Question, *What we are to think of the Bishop of Rome?* and answereth, *the account and unanimous opinion of all the Fathers*, (Oh horrible falshood!) *concerning him was, that this visible Head was necessary to the constituting and preserving of the Unity of the Church.*

Reader, thou should know that this is a great cause of division, not of union; for many Churches have separated from them, and continue without communion with them for this, as well as for other Reasons.

(u) Bellarm. de Concil. autorit. lib. 2. cap. 15.

Bellarmine lays down this Assertion; (u) *The Pope is immediately appointed by Christ*, (but I wonder where) *the Pastor and Head, not only of all particular Churches, but also of the whole Universal Church taken together.* But this is their so well known Doctrine by all, that I need quote no more that do assert it.

VII. *Of Infallibility.*

1. The Doctrine of the Apostles concerning the Fallibility of Churches and Pastors. 1 Cor.

1 Cor. 13. 12. *For now we see through a glass darkly.*——*Now I know but in part.* Gal. 2. 11. *But when I came to Antioch I withstood him* (*Peter*, the Popes pretended Predecessor) *because he was to be blamed*, (and yet his Successor must not be blamed) though through his negligence he should draw many to Hell, as before is shewn.) Ver. 12. *For before that certain came from* James, *he* (Peter) *did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he with-drew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the Circumcision.* 14. *But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto* Peter *before them all, &c.* Reader, from hence thou maist learn that the Successor so called, claimeth a greater priviledg than his supposed Predecessor had, for *Peter* did err, but the Pope (forsooth) cannot; yet Papists call this Text a rough Scripture, for it so puzleth them that they know not how to answer it, *Rom.* 11. 18, 19, 20, 21. turn to it, *ver.* 22. *Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God; on them* (the Church of the *Jews*) *which fell severity; but towards thee* (the Gentile and Church of *Rome* amongst them) *goodness, if thou continue in his goodness*, (as she hath not); *otherwise thou shalt be cut off.* (Where then is her Infallibility)? *Revel.* 18. 2. *Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of Devils*, (and yet cannot err, no more may Devils), *and the hold of every foul spirit*, (and yet boasts she is without spot) *and a cage of every unclean and hurtful bird*; (and yet is the holy Mother-Church, all this is hard to be reconciled.) Read also the second and third Chapters of the Revelation, what is said of the Seven Churches; and then look for good proof that Infallibility is setled by Christ upon the Church of *Rome*, above all other Churches before thou believest any such priviledg to be granted to it.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants and Reformed Churches concerning the Fallibility of Churches.

(*w*) "As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* have "erred; so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred; not only in their living "and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.——(*x*) When "General Councils are gathered together (forasmuch as they be an As"sembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word "of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things per"taining unto God.——Hereunto agree many other Churches in their Confessions. (*y*)

(*w*) Church of Engl. Art. 19.
(*x*) Art. 21.
(*y*) Confes. Helvet. de Eccles. Confes. Saxon. de Eccles. Confes. Wittemberg. de Conciliis.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning Infallibility of the Church.

(*z*) "They teach that the visible Church whose Rector is the Pope "of *Rome*, never hath erred, never can err.

(*a*) *Bellarmine* affirmeth, "1. That the Pope when he teacheth the "whole Church can in no case err in things appertaining to Faith.

(*z*) Catechis. Trident. in Expos. Symb. Apost. de Eccles. Q. 15. Test. Rhemist. Annot. on 1 Tim. 3. 15. & Ephes. 5. 24.
(*a*) Bell. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 4. cap. 3

(b) Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 4. (c) Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 5. (d) Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 6.

"(b) 2. Not only the Pope of *Rome*, but the particular Church of "*Rome* cannot err in Faith. "(c) 3. The Pope of *Rome* cannot err, "not only in Decrees of Faith, but also not in Precepts of Manners, "which are prescribed to the whole Church, and are necessary to Salva- "tion, or in those things which in themselves are good or evil. "(d) 4. It is probably and piously to be believed, that the Pope not "only as Pope, cannot err, but as a particular person cannot be an He- "retick. (This is a foul mistake, for several Popes have been Hereticks "in the judgments of some of their Popes, so that some of them must "needs err, either some of them in being Hereticks, or others of them "in saying they were, if they were not.) "By pertinaciously believing "any thing that is false, contrary to the Faith. 5. Saith he, (e) "Our "opinion is, That the Church cannot absolutely err, neither in things "absolutely necessary, nor in other things, which she propoundeth to "be believed or done by us, whether they be expressly contained in the "Scriptures, or not.----6. (f) In these two things, all the Catholicks "do agree; 1. That the Pope with his General Council cannot err in "making Decrees of Faith, or general Precepts of Manners. 2. That "the Pope alone, or with his particular Council determining any thing "in a doubtful matter, whether he may err or not, ought to be obeyed "by all the faithful. [A goodly Agreement!]

(e) Idem. de Eccles. milit. lib. 3. cap. 14.

(f) Idem. de Rom. Pont. lib. 4. cap. 2.

(g) Catholici tria docent, &c. Becan. Manual. lib. 1. cap. 5.

(g) *Becanus* gives the opinion of the Papists, saying, 1. "That the "Church is the Judg of Controversies. 2. That the Rule by which "the Church doth determine Controversies, or give its definitive sen- "tence, is not the Scripture only, but the Scripture and Tradition to- "gether. 3. That the Church according to the Rule (of Scripture and "Tradition) pronounceth sentence either by the Pope, the Pastor of the "Church, or by a Council approved by the Pope, and both ways in- "fallibly.

(h) Pighi. lib. 4. Hier. Eccl. cap. 8.

(h) *Pighius* also puts in his Judgment, "That the Pope cannot any way "be an Heretick, nor publickly teach Heresie, though he alone deter- "mine any matter.

But Reader, notwithstanding all this confidence of Infallibility whether of Pope, or Councils, or both, they are proved to have erred from the Historical Narratives of their own Writers. *Baronius* acknowledgeth that Pope *Honorius* (i) was counted an Heretick, joyning with the *Monothelites*, or those that denied two Wills in Christ; and by their own *Genebrard* (k); and by the *Rhemists*, though some of them go one way, and some another to salve the Infallibility, yet in vain, when he was condemned by (l) a General Council, and anathematized, with six more holding the same Heresie, and this when the Legats of Pope *Agatho* were present; whose Epistles to *Sergius*, &c. were produced and read in the Council, and judged Heretical, destructive to Mens Souls and condemned to be presently burnt, and so they were.

(i) Spondan. Epitom. Baro. part. 2. p. 96. (k) Genebr. Chron. lib. 3. pag. 484. (l) Concil. Constantinop. 6. act. 13. Sur. Tom. 2 p. 992. Caranz. Sum. Concil. p. 591, 610, 612.

Their own *Baronius* also gives an account of the Barbarous actings of

of Pope *Stephen* (*m*) the Seventh, (called the Sixth) towards the dead body of *Formoſus* his Predeceſſor, for taking it out of the Sepulchre, ſet it clothed in its *Pontificalibus* in the Pontificial ſeat, and after he had derided it, took off its Veſtments, and cut off three fingers, and caſt it into the River *Tiber*; and all that *Formoſus* had ordained, he degraded and ordained them again. This Pope (ſaith the Author) gathering a Synod approved his inhumane fact, which was condemned again by Pope *John* the Ninth, as he had made void the Decrees of *Formoſus*. And thus they can Decree, and others reſcind and decree the contrary, and act worſe than Heathens, and yet not err any of them, in Faith or Manners, which to any mans reaſon ſeemeth very ſtrange.

(*m*) Ita furore percitus homo non quod jure ſiceret, ſed quod exæſtuans rabies ſuaderet, impleus. *Spondan. Epitom. Baron. par.* 2. *p.* 247.

(*n*) Beſides, *Marcellinus* was an Idolater; (*o*) *Liberius* an *Arrian*; *Siricius*, *Calixtus*, *Leo* the 9, and *Paſchalis* condemned Miniſters Marriage. *John* the XXII held, That the Souls of the Wicked ſhould not be puniſhed till the day of Judgment. *John* the XXIII. denied the Souls Immortality. *John* the Eleventh kept for his Paramour a famous Strumpet called *Marozia*. *John* the Thirteenth at Dice called to the Devil for help, and drank an Health to him; lay with his own Mother, and his Fathers Concubine; ordained Deacons in a Stable; for Money made Boys Biſhops; committed Inceſt with two of his Siſters; at laſt being found in the act of Adultery, was ſlain by the Womans Husband.

(*n*) Ipſe Marcellinus ad Sacrificium ductus eſt, ut Sacrificaret, quod & fecit. *Carang. Concil. pag.* 72.

(*o*) Liberium tædio victum exilii, in hæreticam pravitatem ſubſcripſiſſe, aſſerit Hieronimus: teſtantur id ipſum alii quoque antiqui Scriptores; ac deniq; Ipſe Liberius Scriptis literis ad, *&c. Spondan. Epitom. Baron. in Ann.* 357.

(*p*) Pope *Sylveſter* the ſecond was a Conjurer; He enquiring of the Devil how long he ſhould live? was anſwered, *Till he ſhould ſay Maſs in Jeruſalem*; in the *Lent* after as he was ſaying Maſs in the Chappel of Saint *Croſs*, he ſuddenly fell ſick, and remembring that that Chappel was called *Jeruſalem*, he perceived how he was couzened by the Devil. Before he died, he bequeathed his Soul to the Devil, and commanded his Cardinals, *That after his death they ſhould cut his body in pieces and ſo bury him.* (*q*) Pope *Hildebrand* was a Conjurer, and enquiring of the Hoſt (which they ſay is the Body of Chriſt), for an anſwer againſt the Emperour, becauſe it would not ſpeak, *he threw it into the fire and burnt it.* For many Wickedneſſes he was Depoſed and Baniſhed. Pope *Leo* the Tenth, pleaſed with the great Summs of Money which he had got by Indulgences, ſaid to Cardinal *Bembus*, *See what abundance of wealth we have gotten by this Fable of Chriſt.* And when he lay upon his death-bed, the ſame Cardinal rehearſing a Text of Scripture to him, he replied, *Away with theſe Bables concerning Chriſt.* Pope *Nicolas* the firſt

(*p*) *Sylveſtrum Secundum, Benedictum* 9. *Gregorium* 6. *Gregorium* 7. *fuiſſe magos, narrat Bero Cardinalis. Sylveſter* 2: *inter ipſas mortis angustias ſupplicat, manus & linguam ſibi abſcindi, per quas Sacrificando dæmonibus, Deum inhonoravit.*

(*q*) *Hildebrandus, (qui Gregorius* 7.) *Conſecratam Euchariſtiam in ignem projecit, conſulens Dæmones contra Henricum* 4. *Imp. Bero Cardinalis, qui & plura de hoc & aliis Romanis Pontif. miranda narrat, quæ nullus hiſtoricorum neq; Platina, nec quiſquam alius prodidit. Vide. Illyric. Catal. pag.* 219, 220, 221, 223, *&c.*

forbade Marriage to the Clergy; saying, *It was more honest to have to do with many Women privately, than openly to take one Wife. John* the XXIV. was accused before the Council of *Constance* for *Heresie, Simony, Murder, Poysonings, Adulteries, and Sodomy*; which being made good against him he was Deposed and Imprisoned. (r) Pope *Eugenius* the Fourth was Deposed by the General Council at *Basil*, for *being a Simonist, and guilty of Perjury, being a Schismatick, and an obstinate Heretick.* It would make a large Book to give an account of the failings of Popes in matters both of Life and Faith; but I have but little room allowed. Take two general Expressions of their own Authors, and then judg. (s) *What then was the face of the holy Roman Church? How exceeding filthy, when the most potent, and yet the most sordid Whores did rule at Rome?——and their Lovers thrust in* Peter's *Chair?* (t) Another fixt enough to the Popish Religion, acknowledged that *in this one thing that age was unhappy, that for near one hundred and fifty years about fifty Popes did wholly fall away from the virtue of their Ancestors, being rather Apotactical* [irregular] *and Apostatical than Apostolical.*

(r) Laurent. Suri. Concil. Tom. 4. pag. 164.

(s) Vide Luitprand. lib. 2. c. 13. & Baron. Annal. ad An. 912. vel Spondan. — Ex quibus videas fœdissimam hujus temporis Ecclesiæ Romanæ faciem, — ad An. 912.

(t) Genebrar. in Seculum decimum. Infælix dicitur hoc seculum, exhaustum hominibus ingenio & Doctrina claris sive etiam claris principibus & Pontificibus, in quo nihil fere dignum memoria posteritatis gestum sit. Hoc ipso infelicissimum, quod Ecclesia esset, — sine ullo bono fere Pontifice.

And as the Church (if thereby understood the Pope) hath failed, so also if taken for General Councils hath also failed, as is plain by this Infallible Argument, in that several General Councils ratified by Popes have decreed things contradictory, and that in matters of Faith; and some of them must necessarily err, except contradictions can be reconciled, and both parts be true, which is impossible. For example, the General Council of *Constance* and of *Basil* have fully asserted that a General Council is above the Pope, and is to be judged by them, and by them may be deposed; in these words, *not one of the skilful did ever doubt but that the Pope was subject to the judgment of a General Council, in things that concern Faith; and that he cannot without their consent dissolve or remove a General Council, yea and that this is an article of Faith, which without destruction of Salvation cannot be denied, and that the Council is above the Pope,* de fide, *and that it cannot be removed without their own consent, and that he is an Heretick that is against these things.* Thus the Council of *Basil*, owned by Pope *Eugenius*. And the Council of *Constance* (u) confirmed by Pope *Martin* the Fifth, being personally present in it. And yet another General Council at the (w) *Lateran* under *Julius* the second, and *Leo* the tenth, expresly decree on the contrary that

— Hoc vero uno infælix, quod per annos fere 150, Pontifices circiter 50, à Johanne scilicet 8, qui Nicolao, & Adriano 2, sanctis successit, ad Leonem 9, usq; à virtute majorum prorsus defecerint, Apotactici, Apostaticivè potius quam Apostolici, è tanto Pontificum numero, quinq; modo, & satis tenuiter, laudantur, &c. *Genebrard. Chronol. lib* 4. *pag.* 552, 553. (u) Primo definitur quod generalis Synodus in spiritu sancto legitime congregata, generale Concilium faciens, Ecclesiam militantem repræsentans, potestatem à Christo immediatè habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status, etiamsi Papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem & ad extirpationem schismatum, & ad generalem reformationem Ecclesiæ in capite & in membris. Secundò, declarat quod quicunq; cujuscunq; dignitatis, & etiamsi Papalis existat, qui mandatis aut præceptis hujus sanctæ Synodi, & cujuscunq; alterius Concilii generalis: —— Obedire contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignæ pœnitentiæ subjiciatur & debite puniatur. Tertiò, declarat quod

quod ipſum generale Concilium pro præmiſſis, eaque concernentibus Congregatum ſine ipſius conſenſu, per nullum, quavis autoritate, etiamſi Papali dignitate præ fulgent, diſſolvi, transferri, aut ad aliud tempus prorogari poteſt.——Hæc tria ſunt veritates fidei Catholicæ,——quibus pertinaciter repugnans eſt cenſendus hæreticus. (*w*) Cùm etiam ſolum Romanum Pontificem, pro tempore exiſtentem, tanquam authoritatem ſuper omnia concilia habentem, conciliorum indicendorum, transferendorum, ac diſſolvendorum plenum jus & poteſtatem habere, ex — Conciliorum confeſſione manifeſte conſtet. *Laurent. Surius, Concil. Tom.* 4. *pag.*683. There was but one in all the Council, but gave his *placet* hereunto, that would not recede from the determination of the Council of *Baſil*: *Ibid. pag.* 684.

the Pope is above a General Council; till theſe two can be true, both of them, the Pope is above a General Council, and the Pope is not above a General Council, the Infallibility of their Church (and that even in a fundamental Point thereof) is laid in the duſt. Let them chuſe which ſide they will, one did err.

VIII. *Of the Catholick Church.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apoſtles concerning the Catholick or Univerſal Church.

1 Cor. 1. 2. *Unto the Church of God which is at* Corinth,——*with all that in every place call upon the name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, both theirs and ours.* 1 Cor. 12. 13. *For by one ſpirit, we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made drink into one ſpirit.* Rev. 7. 9. *After this I beheld, and lo a great multitude which no man could number, of all Nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues, ſtood before the Throne, and before the Lamb.*——See alſo *Epheſ.* 1. 10, 22. *Act.* 2. 39. *Epheſ.* 2. 19. & 3. 15. *Act.* 2. 47. *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mar.* 16. 15. *Act.* 2. 21. *Rom.* 1. 16. *Gal.* 3. 28. *Act.* 13. 39. *Rom.* 10. 4. *Luk.* 13. 28. *Act.* 10. 35.

Reader, obſerve that theſe Scriptures ſpeak of the Church, under Chriſt the head thereof, (making no mention of owning of, or being joyned to, any mortal man, as their viſible Head) in which Church, (not limited or confined to the Church of *Rome*) there is Salvation.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants concerning the Catholick or Univerſal Church.

"The Catholick or Univerſal Church which is inviſible, conſiſts of "the whole number of the Elect that have been, are, or ſhall be ga- "thered into one, under Chriſt the Head thereof, and is the Spouſe, the "Body, the fulneſs of him that filleth all in all.

"The viſible Church which is alſo Catholick or Univerſal under the "Goſpel, (not confined to one Nation, as before under the Law) "conſiſts of all thoſe throughout the World, that profeſs the true Re- "ligion, together with their Children, and is the Kingdom of the "Lord Jeſus, the Houſe and Family of God, out of which there is no "ordinary poſſibility of Salvation.

(*x*) Conf. Gal. art. 27, 28: Conf. Helvet. 2. cap. 17. Bohem. c. 8: Belg. art. 27: Wittemb. art. 32.

(*x*) This is the Confeſſion alſo of the Churches of *Helvetia*, *Bohemia*, *Belgia*, *Wittemberg*, *&c.*

III. The

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning the Catholick or Universal Church.

(y) Catechis. Rom. in Symb. pag. 139, 141. (z) Concil. Lateran. abrogat. pray. Mat. sanct. Bull. (a) Ad fontem veri perveni. —— Quem sancti doctores, —— quorum una vox est, salvari non posse, qui sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem; omnesq; illas virtutes mancas esse ei, qui summo Pontifici obedire recusat; quamvis in sacco & cinere jacens, dies & noctes jejunet, & oret, & in cæteris videatur legem implere, —— didicimus unam Ecclesiam Catholicam & Apostolicam (subaud. Romanam) esse matrem omnium fidelium, extra quam non invenitur salus. —— *Pius* 2. Bul. Retractationum apud *Laurent. Surium, Concil. Tom.* 4. *pag.* 506.

(y) The *Trent* Catechism maketh that the only Church that is under the Pope, excluding all others that submit not to him as the Vicar of Christ; the same in a General Council made it necessary to Salvation, (z) to be subject to the Pope of *Rome*; by *Leo* the tenth: Pope *Pius* the second approved this Doctrine; ["I came (a) to the fountain of "Truth, which the holy Doctors,----with one voice say, That he can- "not be saved that holdeth not the Unity of the holy Church of *Rome*; "and that all those virtues are maimed to him that refuseth to obey "the Pope of *Rome*, though he lie in sackcloth and ashes, and fast and "pray both day and night, and seem in other things to fulfil the Law "of God.----We learned that the one Catholick and Apostolical Church "(of *Rome*) is the Mother of all the Faithful, out of which there is no "Salvation.----

But Reader, dost thou think that God will damn any holy, humble and believing persons, because they are not subject to the Pope? hath God any where made such subjection to him a condition of Salvation? let them shew it if they can. Or are there no such persons in the World that are holy and believing, that do not submit unto the Pope? There are many thousands that know themselves better than his Infallible Holiness can know them, that know that to be a falshood.

(b) Bellar. de Eccles. Milit. lib. 3. cap. 2.

Neither doth *Bellarmine* vary from them in his definition of the Church; (b) "That it is a company of men knit together in the pro- "fession of the same Christian Faith, and communion of the same Sa- "craments, under the Government of lawful Pastors, especially of the "Bishop of *Rome*, Christs Vicar upon Earth. From whence it might be "easily gathered (saith he) who do belong to the Church, and who "do not. There are three parts (as he goeth on) of this definition of "the Church. 1. Profession of the true Faith. 2. Communion of "the Sacraments. 3. Subjection to the Pope of *Rome* the lawful Pa- "stor. By the first all Infidels, Turks, Pagans, Hereticks and Apostates "are excluded from the Church. By the second, Catechumens and Ex- "communicated persons be excluded. By the third, all Schismaticks "that have the Word and Sacraments, but do not submit to the law- "ful Pastor, (the Pope); but all others though they be Reprobates, "wicked and ungodly are included in the Church.

Mark this, good Reader, whether this sounds like the Apostles Doctrine before laid down, if men be never so good, and holy, though con-

converted, and believe, if they do not ſubmit to the Pope as the Univerſal Head, they are no Members of Chriſts Church, nor can be ſaved; and if they be wicked and ungodly, if they own the Pope they are included in the Church. Oh what an odious Religion is that, which damns all the Chriſtians in the world beſides themſelves! O what wretched diſſembling is this, to call their Church the moſt holy Church without ſpot or wrinkle or any ſuch thing; when the worſt might be and are owned as Members thereof, if they profeſs ſubjection to the Pope! but however by this the Head and Members are conformable, and let them go together.-----

IX. *Of Juſtification.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apoſtles concerning Juſtification.

Rom. 4. 5. *Now to him that worketh not, but believeth on him, that juſtifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteouſneſs.* 6. *Even as* David *deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works.* 7. *Saying, Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered.* 8. *Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute ſin.* 2 Cor. 5. 19. *Not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them.* 21. *For he hath made him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him.* Rom. 3. 22. *Even the righteouſneſs of God, which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt, unto all, and upon all that do believe.* 24. *Being juſtified freely by his grace, through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.* See *ver.* 25, 28. and *Tit.* 3. 5, 7. *Rom.* 5. 17, 18, 19. *Gal.* 2. 16. *Phil.* 3. 9. *Act.* 13. 38, 39. *Epheſ.* 2. 8, 9.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants concerning Juſtification.

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the Merit of our "Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt by Faith, and not for our own works "and deſervings. (c) Confeſ. Helvet. 1. 4. 16. & 2. cap. 15. Bohemic. cap. 6, 7. Gal. art. 12. 22. Auguſt. art. 4. 6. 26. Belg. art. 22, 24. Wittemberg. art. 5. Baſil art. 8.

"Thoſe whom God effectually calleth, he alſo freely juſtifieth; not "by infuſing righteouſneſs into them, but by pardoning their ſins, and "by accounting and accepting their perſons as righteous; not for any "thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Chriſts ſake alone. "Imputing the Obedience and Satisfaction of Chriſt unto them, they "receiving and reſting on Him, and his Righteouſneſs by Faith, which "Faith they have, not of themſelves, it is the gift of God.

To this Doctrine conſent the (c) Reformed Churches in *Helvetia, Bohemia, France, Belgia*, &c.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning Juſtification.

"(d) Juſtification is not only the forgiveneſs of ſin, but alſo the (d) Juſtificatio non eſt ſola peccatorum remiſſio ſed &

Sanctificatio & renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam ſuſceptionem gratiæ & donorum, &c. unica formalis cauſa ejus eſt juſtitia Dei, &c. qua videlicet, abeo donati, renovamur ſpiritu mentis noſtræ, &c. Si quis dixerit homines juſtificari vel ſola imputatione juſtitiæ Chriſti, vel ſola peccatorum remiſſione, excluſa gratia, & charitate, quæ in cordibus eorum per Spiritum ſanctum diffundatur, atq; illis inhæreat, aut etiam gratiam qua juſtificamur, eſſe tantum favorem Dei, anathema ſit. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 6.*

Sancti-

"Sanctification and Renovation of the inward man by a voluntary ſuſ-
"ception of grace and gifts, whereby a man of unjuſt is made juſt, and
"of an enemy is made a friend, that he might be an heir according to
"the hope of eternal life.-----The only formal cauſe of Juſtification is
"the righteouſneſs of God, not wherewith he himſelf is righteous, but
"whereby he makes us righteous, namely, by which, being given to
"us by him, we are renewed in the ſpirit of our mind, and not only
"reputed, but are, and are truly called righteous, receiving righteouſ-
"neſs in our ſelves, every one according to his meaſure, which the
"holy Spirit imparteth to each, as he will, according to every ones
"own diſpoſition, and co-working.-----If any one ſhall ſay that a man
"is juſtified by the ſole Imputation of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or in
"the ſole remiſſion of Sin, excluding Grace and Charity, which is ſhed
"abroad in their hearts by the holy Spirit, and is inherent in him, or
"that the Grace whereby we are juſtified is only the favour of God, let
"him be accurſed:

Reader, by this Council thou maiſt ſee, how the Papiſts do confound Juſtification, and Sanctification together, and place it in our inherent Righteouſneſs; though theſe are not ſeparated, that any ſhould be juſtified that are not ſanctified, penitent, and believing, yet they are carefully to be diſtinguiſhed.

X. *Of Merit of good Works.*

I. The Doctrine of Prophets, Chriſt, and his Apoſtles.

Iſa. 64. 6. *All our righteouſneſſes are as filthy rags.* Job 22. 2. *Can a man be profitable unto God? 3. Is it any gain to him that thou makeſt thy way perfect?* Job 35. 7. *If thou be righteous what giveſt thou unto him? or what receiveth he of thy hand?* Luk. 17. 10. *We are unprofitable ſervants, we have done that which was our duty to do.* Rom. 8. 18. *For I reckon that the ſufferings of this preſent time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that ſhall be revealed in us.* Alſo *Pſal.* 130. 3. & 143. 2. *Rom.* 4. 2, 4, 5, 6. 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *Eph.* 2. 9.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

(t) Confeſſ. Wittemb. de bonis operibus. Bohem. art. 7. Saxon. art. 3. & 8. Auguſt. art. 4. & 20. Helvet. 2. c. 16. Belg. art. 24. Argentinenſ. cap. 10.

"We cannot by our beſt Works merit pardon of Sin, or Eternal Life
"at the hand of God, by reaſon of the great diſproportion that is be-
"tween them and the Glory to come, and the infinite diſtance that there
"is between us and God, whom by them we can neither profit, nor ſatis-
"fie for the debt of our former ſins, but when we have done all we
"can, we have done but our duty, and are unprofitable ſervants; and
"becauſe as good they proceed from his Spirit, yet as they are wrought
"by us, they are defiled and mixed with ſo much weakneſs and imper-
"fection, that they cannot endure the ſeverity of Gods judgment. To
this Doctrine the Reformed Churches do ſubſcribe. (t)

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

"If any one ſhall ſay, That the good Works of a juſtified perſon are

"ſo

"ſo the gifts of God, that they may not alſo be the good Merits of him "that is juſtified, or that he that is juſtified, doth not by the good works "which he doth, by the Grace of God and Merit of Chriſt (of whom he "is a living Member) truly merit increaſe of grace, eternal life, and (if "he depart in a ſtate of Grace) the enjoyment thereof, and moreover alſo "increaſe of Glory, let him be accurſed. *(f)*

(f) Si quis dixerit hominis juſtificati bona opera ita eſſe dona Dei, ut non ſint etiam bona ipſius juſtificati merita, aut ipſum juſtificatum bonis operibus, *&c.* non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam & ipſius vitæ æternæ, *&c.* conſecutionem, atq; etiam gloriæ augmentum, anathema ſit. *Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 6.*

"Mens works proceeding from Grace deſerve or merit Heaven.---- "If the joy of Heaven be retribution, repayment, hire-wages for "works, then works can be no other but the value, deſert, price, "worth and merit of the ſame.----The word Reward in *Latin* or *Greek* "is the very ſtipend that the hired Workman *(g)* or Journey-man "covenanteth to have of him, whoſe work he doth, and is a thing e- "qually and juſtly anſwering to the time and weight of his travels and "works,-----rather than a free-gift, *&c.* *(h)* it is moſt clear to all not "blinded in pride and contention, that good Works are meritorious, and "the very cauſe of Salvation.

(g) Rhemiſts on 1 Cor. 3.8.

(h) Rhem. on Heb. 6. 10.

(i) The Heavenly Bleſſedneſs which the Scripture calls the Reward "of the Juſt, is not given of God *gratis* and freely, but is due to their "Works.------Yea God hath ſet forth Heaven to ſale for our Works. "*(k)* Far be it from us that the righteous ſhould look for eternal life, "as a poor man doth for his alms, for it is much more honour for them "as victors and triumphers to poſſeſs it, as the garland which by their "labour they have deſerved. *(l)* Although the reſtauration of Mankind "be aſcribed to the Merits of Chriſt, yet it is not for Chriſts Merits "that our Works are rewarded with eternal life; neither doth God, "when he gives the Reward, look towards Chriſts death, but only to the "firſt inſtitution of Mankind, wherein by the Law of nature it was "appointed that in the juſt judgment of God, obedience ſhould be re- "warded with life, as diſobedience is with death.

(i) Andrad. orth. expl. l. 6.

(k) Dean of Lovan Expli. art. Lovan. Tom. 2. art. 9.

(l) Bayus de Merit. operum lib. 1. c. 9.

(m) "A ſupernatural Work proceeding from Grace, within it ſelf, "and of its own nature, hath a proportion and condignity with the "Reward, and a ſufficient value to be worth the ſame. The Reward there- "fore is not given for Chriſts Merit,----It muſt not be denied but our "Merits are true Merits, ſo that the Works of the godly proceeding "from Grace, have of themſelves an inward worthineſs, and are pro- "portionable to the Reward, *&c.*

(m) Suarez. Tom. 1. in The. 3. d. 41. Sect. 3. ſi. ſecundo, & oportet:

The Papiſts in this Point are not all of a mind, but many of them ſwell with horrible pride, and think themſelves do deſerve Heaven as well as a Journey-man doth his Wages, and cannot be brought to ſtoop ſo low, as to receive the higheſt happineſs as the free gift of God.

XI. *Of Works of Supererogation.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture.

Nehem. 13. 22. *And I commanded the Levites that they ſhould cleanſe themſelves.*-----*Remember me O my God, concerning this alſo, and ſpare me according to the greatneſs of thy mercies.* Luk. 17. 10. Gal. 5. 17.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

"Voluntary works, beſides, over and above Gods Commandments, "which they call works of Supererogation, cannot be taught with- "out arrogancy and impiety, for by them men do declare that they do (n) Confeſſ. Helvet. 2. c. 16. Auguſt. art. 20. Gal. art. 24. Sax. art. 3. 17. Baſil. art. 10. Belg. art. 12. "not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that "they do more for his ſake, than of bounden duty is required, whereas "Chriſt ſaith plainly, *When ye have done all that are commanded you, ſay we are unprofitable ſervants.*

Againſt ſuch Works are the Reformed (n) Churches alſo in *Helvetia, France, Saxony, &c.*

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

(o) Rhemiſts on 2 Cor. 8. 14. "(o) The faſtings and ſatisfactory deeds of one man, be available "to others, yea, and holy Saints, and other vertuous perſons may in "meaſure and proportion of other mens neceſſities and deſervings allot "unto them, as well the Supererogation of their Spiritual Works, as "thoſe that do abound in worldly goods may give Alms of their Su- "perfluities, to them which are in neceſſity. Again, they expound 1 *Cor. 9. 16.* "But now preaching not only as enjoined me, but alſo "as of Love and Charity, and freely without putting any man to coſt, "and that voluntarily and of very deſire to ſave my Hearers, I ſhall have "my reward of God, yea, and a reward of Supererogation, which is "given to them that of abundant Charity do more in the ſervice of God "than they be commanded.

But Reader, though a man might have more Money than he doth need, yet thou ſhalt not find a man that hath more Grace than he doth need, and he that cannot ſatisfie for himſelf cannot impart ſatisfaction to another; for none can give what they have not; and if we do what is no way commanded, we might hear, Who hath required this at your hands? and though *Paul* was not burdenſome to the *Corinthians*, yet he received from other Churches to do them ſervice. So that all that is ſaid falls ſhort to prove Works of Supererogation: Let proud Papiſts boaſt of doing more, while thou goeſt to thy knees to lament, that when thou haſt done thy moſt and beſt, haſt done leſs than is commanded.

XII. *Of Religious Worſhip.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that Religious Worſhip is due only to God.

Mat. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Col. 2. 18. *Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility*

humility and worſhipping of Angels. Rev. 19. 10. *And I fell at his feet to worſhip him, and he ſaid unto me, ſee thou do it not; I am thy fellow-ſervant,----worſhip God.* See alſo Rev. 22. 8, 9. Act. 10. 25. *As* Peter *was coming in,* Cornelius *met him and fell down at his feet and worſhipped him.* 26. *But* Peter *took him up, ſaying, ſtand up, I my ſelf alſo am a man.* Read alſo *Act.* 14. 13, 14, 15, 18. *Rom.* 10. 14.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

"(p) Religious Worſhip is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and "Holy Ghoſt, and to him alone, and not to Angels, Saints, or any o- "ther creature.----The acceptable way of Worſhipping the true God, "is inſtituted by himſelf, and ſo limited to his own revealed Will, that "he may not be Worſhipped according to the imaginations and devices "of men, or the ſuggeſtions of Satan, under any viſible repreſentati- "ons, or any other way not preſcribed in the holy Scripture. In this the Reformed Churches do agree in their publick Confeſſions.

(p) Confeſſ. Helvet. c. 4, 5. Gall. art. 24. Belgic. art. 26. Argent c. 11. Auguſt. art. 21 Saxon. de Invocation. &c.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning Religious Worſhip given to Saints, and their Reliques, and to Images.

(q) "The holy Synod of *Trent* doth command all Biſhops and o- "thers that have the office and care of teaching that according to the "uſe of the Catholick and Apoſtolical Church (that is falſe,) received "from the Primitive times of the Chriſtian Religion, and according to "the conſent of the holy Fathers, (this is falſe too,) and Decrees of "ſacred Councils, (which yet have decreed againſt it,) that they firſt "of all diligently inſtruct the faithful concerning the Interceſſion and "Invocation of Saints, the honour of Reliques, and the lawful uſe of "Images, teaching them that the Saints reigning together with Chriſt, "do offer their Prayers to God for men, and that it is good and pro- "fitable, humbly kneeling to call upon them; and to run to their "Prayers, help and aid, for the benefits to be obtained from God "through his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and

(q) Mandat ſancta Synodus omnibus Epiſcopis, & cæteris docendi munus curamq; ſuſtinentibus, ut juxta Catholicæ & Apoſtolicæ Eccleſiæ uſum, à primævis Chriſtianæ Religionis temporibus receptum, Sanctorumq; patrum conſenſionem & ſacrorum Conciliorum decreta, imprimis de Sanctorum Interceſſione, Invocatione, reliquiarum honore & legitimo Imaginum uſu fideles diligenter inſtruant, docentes eos, Sanctos, una cum Chriſto regnantes orationes ſuas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile eſſe ſimpliciter eos invocare, & ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per filium ejus, &c. ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumq; confugere; illos vero qui negant ſanctos æterna fælicitate in cœlo fruentes, invocandos eſſe, aut qui aſſerunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam ſingulis orent, Invocationem eſſe Idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adverſariq; honori unius Mediatoris Dei, & hominum Jeſu Chriſti, vel ſtultum eſſe, in cœlo regnantibus voce, vel mente ſupplicare, impie ſentire: Sanctorum quoq; Martyrum, & aliorum cum Chriſto viventium ſancta corpora quæ viva membra Chriſti fuerint, & templum Spiritus ſancti, ab ipſo ad æternam vitam ſuſcitanda, & glorificanda, à fidelibus veneranda eſſe, per quæ multa beneficia à Deo hominibus præſtantur; ita ut affirmantes ſanctorum Reliquiis venerationem atq; honorem non deberi, vel eas, aliaq; ſacra monumenta à fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atq; eorum opis impetrandæ cauſa ſanctorum memorias fruſtra frequentari, damnandos eſſe, prout jampridem eos damnavit, & nunc etiam damnat Eccleſia. Imagines porro, Chriſti, Deiparæ virginis & aliorum ſanctorum, in templis præſertim habendas & retinendas, eiſque debitum honorem & venerationem impertiendam. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 25.

"Saviour; and that they are of a wicked opinion that ſay, that the "Saints enjoying eternal happineſs in Heaven are not to be called up-"on; or who do affirm, either that they do not pray for men, or that "to pray to them, that they would pray for us, yea each one particu-"larly, is Idolatry, or contrary to the Word of God, or againſt the ho-"nour of Jeſus, the one Mediator of God and Men; or that it is "a fooliſh thing to make humble requeſt in words, or in our "minds to thoſe that are reigning in Heaven. Moreover, "that the ſacred bodies of the holy Martyrs and others "living with Chriſt, which were living Members of Chriſt, and the "Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, which ſhall be raiſed by him to eternal life "and be glorified, are to be worſhipped by Believers, by which God "beſtoweth many benefits on men. So that whoſoever ſhall ſay, that "Veneration and Honour is not due to the Reliques of the Saints, or "that theſe and other ſacred Monuments are without profit honour-"ed [worſhipped] by the faithful; and that for the gaining of their "help the memory of Saints in vain is ſolemnized, are utterly to be "condemned, even as the Church hath long condemned them, and "doth now condemn them. Moreover, the Images of Chriſt, the Vir-"gin *Mary*, and of other Saints are eſpecially to be had and kept in "Churches, and due honour and Veneration to be given to them.

Again, "It is beyond all doubt, that Believers according to the "cuſtom always received in the Catholick Church ſhould give to the "holy Sacrament, the Worſhip of *Latria*, (Higheſt Worſhip) which is "due to the true God. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 13. *cap.* 5.

The Popiſh Doctors maintain of Images in general, that they ought to be worſhipped with the ſame Adoration as the thing repreſented by the Image. So *Aquinas*. The ſame reverence is given to the Image of Chriſt as to Chriſt himſelf. Since therefore Chriſt is worſhipped with Adoration of *Latria* (Higheſt Worſhip due to God) it follows that his Image ought to be worſhipped with Adoration of *Latria* (or Higheſt Worſhip due to God.)

XIII. *Of Tranſubſtantiation.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that after Conſecration in the Lords Supper there is real Bread and Wine.

Mat. 26. 26, 27. *Luk.* 22. 19, 20. 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. *The Lord Jeſus the ſame night in which he was betrayed took bread.* 24. *And when he had given thanks----he took the cup----ſaying, This cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood.* Mark Reader, after the bleſſing it is called Bread. 26. *As often as ye eat this bread, drink this cup.* 27. *Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread.* 28. *Examine----and eat of that bread.* 1 Cor. 10. 16. *The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt.* Act. 20. 7. *They came together to break bread.* 11. *And had broken bread.*-----

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

"Tranſubſtantiation (or the change of the ſubſtance of Bread and "Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by holy writ; but

"but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the "nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasions to many Superstiti- "ons,-----and Idolatries, and is repugnant to very sense and reason. Which reasons have moved all the Reformed Churches against the Doctrine of Transubstantion. (r).

(r) Conf. Helv. 1. art. 22. & 2. c. 21. Wittem. c. 19. de Euchar. Basil. art. 6. Scotican. art. 21.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

(s) "If any shall deny the Body and Blood, together with the Soul "and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so whole Christ to be "truly, really and substantially contained in the most holy Sacrament "of the Eucharist (Lords Supper) but shall say, it is there only as in a "sign, either figuratively or virtually, let him be accursed. If any "shall say, that the substance of Bread and Wine together with the Body "and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, doth remain in the Sacrament of "the holy Eucharist, and shall deny that wonderful and singular con- "version of the whole substance of the Bread into his Body, and of "the whole substance of the Wine into his Blood (the figures of Bread "and Wine only remaining) which Conversion [change] the Catholick "Church doth most fitly call Transubstantiation, let him be accursed.

(s) Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ Sacramento contineri, verè, realiter, & substantialiter corpus & sanguinem, unà cum anima & divinitate Christi, &c. Si quis dixerit in Sacrasancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento remanere substantiam panis & vini, &c. negaveritq; mirabilem illam & singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, & totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, &c. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 13. *Can.* 1, 2.

XIV. *Of Receiving both kinds.*

I. The Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, that those that have the Bread should also have the Cup.

Mark 14. 22, 23, 24. Luk. 22. 19, 20. 1 Cor. 10. 16. & 11. 24. *Take, eat,*-----25.-----*as oft as ye drink it.*----26. *eat this bread, and drink this cup*----27. *shall eat this bread and drink this cup,*----*so let him eat*----- *and drink of this cup.* 29. *for he that eateth and drinketh.*-----

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

"The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people, for "both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Christs Ordinance and "Commandment, ought to be ministred to all Christian men alike. That "the People are to receive the Wine also, is the Confession of Reformed Churches in *Helvetia*, *Bohemia*, *France*, &c. (t)

(t) Confes. Helv. 1. art. 22. & 2. c. 21. Bohem. c. 13. Gall. 36, 38. Wittemb. cap. 19. Belg. art. 35. Saxon. de cæna Domin. August. de missa, art. 1, 2.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

The Council of *Constance* decreed, "(u) That though Christ admini- "stred this Sacrament in both kinds to his Disciples, and in the Primi- "tive Church it was also accordingly received by Believers under both "kinds [Bread and Wine,] *hoc tamen non obstante*, (notwithstanding "Christs Institution, and the example of the Primitive Church) the "Lay-people shall have the bread only. Others that pertinaciously "affirm otherwise are to be expelled as Hereticks. Also we command "upon pain of Excommunication that no Presbyter administer it to "the people under both kinds of Bread and Wine. The *Council of*

(u) Concil. Constant. Sess. 13.

Trent

Trent to the same purpose did decree, The taking away the Cup from the People, (w) notwithstanding Christs Institution, and administration of it in both kinds, "having a power to alter and change, so "that they keep the substance of the Sacrament, as they judg most pro- "fitable for the receivers; and though they confess the Primitive "Church received both, yet the Church of *Rome* for grand and just "reasons hath approved and decreed the Peoples taking of it in one "kind only.

(w) *Concil. Trident. Sess.21 cap. 1, 2, 3.*

XV. *Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apostle *Paul.*

Heb. 9. 22. *And almost all things are by the Law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission.* 25. *Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high Priest entreth into the holy place every year with the blood of others.* 26. *(For then must he have often suffered since the foundation of the world) but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sins by the sacrifice of himself.* 28. *So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.*------Heb. 10. 11. *And every Priest standeth daily ministring and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins.* 12. *But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sate down on the right hand of God.* 14. *For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.* 18. *Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.* Read also *Heb.* 7.23,24,25,26,27.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

Confes. Helvet. 1. art. 22. & 2. cap. 20, 21. Basil. art. 6. Saxon. art. 14. Belg. art. 35. Wittemb. c. 19 Bohem. c. 13. Augustan. de Missa, art. 13.

"The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect Redemption, Pro- "pitiation, and Satisfaction for all the sins of the whole World, both "original and actual, and there is no other satisfaction for sin, but that "alone. Wherefore the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was com- "monly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to "have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dan- "gerous deceits. This is the Doctrine of all Reformed Churches a- "gainst the sacrifice of Mass. (x)

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

(q) Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offerri Deo verum & proprium sacrificium,——

(y) "If any shall say that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is "not offered to God, let him be accursed. If any shall say in those "words (do this in remembrance of me) Christ did not institute his "Apostles to be Priests, or that he did not ordain, that they and other "Priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed.

Anathema sit. Si quis dixerit, illis verbis, hoc facite in meam Commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostoles sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut, ipsi aliiq; sacerdotes offerrent corpus & sanguinem suum, Anathema sit. Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis & gratiarum actionis, &c. non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti, neq; pro vivis & defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, & aliis necessitatibus offerri debere, anathema sit. *Concil. Trident. Sess.22. de Sacrific. Missæ, Can.* 1, 2, 3.

"If

"If any ſhall ſay the ſacrifice of Maſs is only of praiſe and thankſ-
"giving, or a bare Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the
"Croſs, and not a Propitiatory ſacrifice, or that it profits him alone
"that takes it, and ought not to be offered for quick and dead for ſins,
"puniſhments and ſatisfactions, and other neceſſities, let him be accur-
"ſed.

So in that part of the Maſs called the Offertory, the Prieſt ſaith, "Holy
"Father, Eternal and Almighty God, receive this Immaculate Hoſt,
"which I thine unworthy ſervant, offer unto thee my true and living
"God, for my innumerable ſins, and offences and neglects, and for all
"them that ſtand here about, and alſo for all faithful Chriſtians, both
"living and dead, that it may profit me and them unto Salvation, into
"eternal life. *Amen.*

Again, in the Maſs-book the Prieſt prayeth: "We beſeech thee, there-
"fore moſt merciful Father through Jeſus Chriſt thy Son our Lord, and
"do ask of thee that thou wilt accept, and bleſs theſe † gifts, theſe †
"preſents, theſe holy Sacrifices Immaculate, eſpecially thoſe
"which we offer unto thee for thy holy Catholick Church,----and
"all them that aſſiſt here,----for themſelves and for all theirs, for the
"Redemption of their Souls, and for the hope of their Salvation.----
"Which Oblation, thou, O God, vouchſafe in all things to make bleſ-
"ſed † Aſcript, † Reaſonable † and acceptable; that it may be made
"unto us the Body and Blood † of thy moſt beloved Son.----We pre-
"ſent to thy excellent Majeſty of thy gifts and things given, a pure †
"Hoſt, a holy † Hoſt, an Immaculate † Hoſt, the holy Bread † of eternal
"life, and the Cup † of eternal Salvation.----We humbly pray thee, Al-
"mighty God, command that theſe things be carried by the hands of
"thy holy Angels on thy Altar on high, into the preſence of thy Di-
"vine Majeſty, that we all who of the Partici†pation of thine Altar
"[*kiſſes here the Altar,*] have taken the holy Body and Blood † of thy
"Son, may be filled with all Heavenly Bleſ†ſings and Grace,----*And*
then the Prieſt for the Dead prays, "Be mindful alſo, O Lord, of thy
"Men-ſervants, and Women-ſervants [*naming their names that are*
deceaſed, for whom friends or kindred would have Maſs,] "who have pre-
"ceeded us with the ſign of the Faith, and who ſleep in a ſleep of
"peace.

View and conſider this little piece which I have tranſcribed, Reader, for thy ſake, out of the Maſs-book, and then judg whether there be any ſuch thing concerning the Lords-Supper in the Scripture; and whether theſe be not new Doctrines and Devices.

XVI. *Of Worſhipping the Hoſt.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture concerning the Lords-Supper, where it is treated of, containeth nothing for the worſhipping of it; as *Mat.*26.26,27. *Mar.*14.22,23,24. 1 *Cor.*11.24,25,26,27,28,29.

II. The

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

(z) Confess. Helvet. 2. c. 21. Saxo. de cæna Dom. Wittemb. de Eucharist. Basil. art. 6.

"The worshipping the Elements, the lifting them up, or carrying "them about for Adoration, and the reserving of them for any pretended Religious use, are all contrary to the nature of this Sacrament, "and to the Institution of Christ. *So say other Reformed Churches in their publick Confessions of faith.* (z)

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

(a) Nullus itaq; dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto, latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant, &c.

(a) "It is beyond all doubt that the faithful, according to the custom always received in the Catholick Church [*That is poorly begun of a learned Council.*] "may give in veneration the Worship of *Latria*, [*Highest Worship*] "which is due to God, to this holy Sacrament; for "it is not the less to be adored, because it was appointed by the Lord to "be received; for we believe that the same God is present in it, whom "the eternal Father, bringing into the world, saith, *And let all the Angels of God worship him.*

(b) Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. cap. 5.

Moreover the holy Synod doth declare (b) "That with very great "Religion and Piety of the Church was this custom brought in, that "every year upon some peculiar holy-day, this high and venerable Sacrament with singular Veneration and Solemnity should be celebrated; "and that it should in Processions, reverently with honour and worship "be carried about through the ways and publick places.

XVII. *Of Auricular Confession.*

I. The Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles concerning Confession of Sin.

Luk. 17. 3, 4. *Jam.* 5. 16. 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. See also *Prov.* 28. 13. *Psal.* 32. 5, 6. and 51. 4, 5, 7, 9, 14. In all which places there is Confession of Sin to God, to the party wronged by us, and to one another; but not a word of secret Confession of all our Sins in the ears of the Priest.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

(c) Confess. Helvet. 2. c. 14. Argentinens. c. 20. August. de Confess. Saxon. de Pœnitentia. Wittemb. de Confessione.

"As every man is bound to make private Confession of his Sins to "God, praying for the pardon thereof, upon which and the forsaking "of them he shall find mercy; so he that scandalizeth his brother, or the "Church of God, ought to be willing by a private or publick Confession and sorrow for his sin, to declare his Repentance to those that are "offended, who are therefore to be reconciled, and in love to receive him. So other Reformed Churches. (c)

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

(d) Concil. Lateran. Can. 21.

(d) "Let every one both Men and Women truly make Confession of "all their Sins at least once a year to their own Priest, or some other, "having leave first from their own Priest, else he can neither absolve nor "bind him.

(e) The

(e) "The universal Church to the great profit of Souls doth keep "the custom of Confession in that holy and most acceptable time of *Lent*, "which also this holy Synod doth most highly approve and receive, as "piously, and with good cause to be retained.

(e) Unde jam in universa Ecclesia, cum ingenti animarum fidelium fructu, observatur mos ille salutaris, sacro illo & maximè acceptabili tempore Quadragesimæ, quem morum, &c. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 14. *cap.* 5.

(f) "If any shall deny Sacramental Confession, either to be institu- "ted, or to be necessary to Salvation by Divine right; or shall say the "manner of making secret Confession to the Priest alone,-----is not in- "stituted and commanded by Christ, but is an humane invention, let "him be accursed.

(f) Si quis negaverit Confessionem Sacramentalem, vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino, &c. *Concil. Trident: Sess.* 14. *can.* 6.

(g) "If any shall say that in the Sacrament of Penance it is not neces- "sary to remission of sin, and that by Divine right, to confess all, and "every mortal sin, that one can by all due diligent præmeditation call to "remembrance, even those that are secret sins, and against the last pre- "cept of the Decalogue, and the very circumstances which alter the "kinds of sin,----let him be accursed.

(g) Si quis dixerit in Sacramento pœnitentiæ ad remissionē peccatorum necessarium non esse jure Divino confiteri, omnia & singula peccata mortalia, &c. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 14. *Can.* 7.

XVIII. *Of Penitential Satisfaction.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture.

Ezek. 16. 61. *Then shalt thou remember thy ways and be ashamed.*----62. *And I will establish my Covenant with thee.*-----63. *That thou mayest remember and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame, when I am pacified towards thee, for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord.* And 36. 31, *Ye shall loath your selves in your own sight.* 32. *Not for your sakes do I this.*-----*Be ashamed and confounded for your own ways.* See *Hos.* 14. 2, 4.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

"Although Repentance be not to be rested in as any satisfaction for "Sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of Gods free "Grace in Christ; yet is it of such necessity to all Sinners, that none "might expect pardon without it. So other Churches. (b)

(b) August. de Confessione. Saxon. in Præfatione, & artic. de Satisfactione. Wittenb. de Satisfactione.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

(i) "If any shall say, that the whole punishment together with the "guilt, is always remitted by God, and that the satisfaction of the "penitent is no other than the Faith whereby he apprehendeth Christ "to have satisfied for him, let him be accursed.

(i) Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 12.

(k) "If any shall say, That God is not satisfied for sins, as to tem- "poral punishment, through the Merits of Christ, by the punishments "which he inflicts, and we patiently bear, or by such as are enjoyned

(k) Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 13.

" by the Prieſt, nor by thoſe that we voluntarily put our ſelves unto,
" nor by Faſtings, Prayers, Almes-deeds, and other works of Piety,
" and that therefore the beſt Repentance is only a new life, let him be
" accurſed.

(*l*) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 14. Can. 14.

(*l*) " If any ſhall ſay, That the Satisfactions whereby Penitents
" through Jeſus Chriſt do redeem Sins, are not the Worſhip of God,
" but the Traditions of men, thwarting the Doctrine of the Grace,
" and true Worſhip of God, and the benefits of the death of Chriſt, let
" him be accurſed.

XIX. *Of Venial Sins.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Mat. 12. 36. *I ſay unto you that every idle word that men ſhall ſpeak, they ſhall give account thereof in the day of judgment.* Rom. 6. 23. *For the wages of ſin is death.*-----See *Rom.* 5. 12. and *Iſa.* 55. 7.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

(*m*) Confeſ. Bohemic. art. 4. Saxon. de diſcrimine peccatorum.

" As there is no ſin ſo ſmall but it deſerves damnation, ſo there is no
" ſin ſo great, that it can bring damnation upon thoſe that truly re-
" pent. So other Churches alſo. (*m*)

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

" Some Sins are venial, neither offering injury to God, nor deſerving
" Hell, nor binding us to be ſorry for them, but may be forgiven by
" knocking of the breſt, (*n*) going into a Church, receiving holy
" Water, or the Biſhops bleſſing, or croſſing ones ſelf, or by any work
" of Charity, though we never think actually of them. (*o*) Thoſe
" ſins which in their own nature are not contrary to the love of God,
" and our Neighbour, as idle words, immoderate laughing, thoſe ſins
" that are not perfectly voluntary, as ſudden motions of anger, *&c.* and
" are in trivial things, as ſtealing of an half-peny, *&c.* are venial ſins;
" that is, do not turn us from God, and are eaſily expiated, like unto
" a ſlight hurt, which doth not endanger life, and is eaſily cured.

(*n*) Aquin. par. 3. Queſt. 87. art. 3.

(*o*) Bellarm. Tom. 3. de amiſſione gratiæ. Lib. 1. c. 3.

Idem. ibid. cap. 2.

XX. *Of the ſtate of Men after Death.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture concerning the ſtate of Men after Death.

Luk. 23. 43. *Verily I ſay unto thee, this day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.* Heb. 12. 23. *And to the ſpirits of juſt men made perfect.* 2 Cor. 5. 1. *For we know that if our earthly houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a building of God.* 8. *Willing rather to be abſent from the body and to be preſent with the Lord.* Phil. 1. 23. *Having a deſire to depart and to be with Chriſt.* See alſo *Mat.* 7. 13, 14. *Joh.* 3. 18. *Luk.* 16. 23, 24. where and in other places, the Scriptures ſpeak of two ways, one leading to deſtruction, the other to life. Two ſorts of men, ſome that do not believe, and they are damned, ſome that do, and they are ſaved, no third.

II. The

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

"The Bodies of men after death return to duſt, and ſee corruption, "but their Souls (which neither die nor ſleep) having an Immortal ſub- "ſiſtence, immediately return to God, who gave them. The Souls of "the Righteous being then made perfect in Holineſs, are received into "the higheſt Heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and "glory, waiting for the full Redemption of their Bodies; and the Souls "of the Wicked are caſt into Hell, where they remain in torments and "utter darkneſs, reſerved to the Judgment of the great Day: Beſides "theſe two places for Souls ſeparated from their Bodies, the Scripture "acknowledgeth none. So the Reformed Churches alſo (*p*) in *Helvetia*, *France*, *Saxony*, *&c.* (*p*)

(*p*) Confeſſ. Helv. 2. cap. 26. Gall. art. 24. Saxon. art. 11. Auguſt. art. 11. Wittemberg. cap. 25.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

(*q*) "If any ſhall ſay that after the Grace of Juſtification received, "the offence is ſo forgiven to every penitent Sinner, and guilt of eter- "nal puniſhment ſo removed, that there remains no guilt of temporal "puniſhment to be ſuffered, either in this life, or the life to come in "Purgatory, let him be accurſed.

(*q*) Concil. Trident. Seſ. 6. Can. 30. & Decret. de Purgat. Seſſ. 25.

By this Parallel of Doctrines you may eaſily judg that ours is the old Religion, and the Religion of the Papiſts (wherein they differ from us), is a new Religion; for they that do own, profeſs and hold to the ſame Doctrines and Worſhip that were taught by Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles, and no other (as to Eſſentials at leaſt) are of the old Religion; and thoſe that forſaking and corrupting the Doctrine and Worſhip taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, maintain and hold Doctrines not contained in the Scripture, but riſen up ſince and contrary to it, are of a new Religion; But the Proteſtants do the firſt, and the Papiſts do the laſt, as appeareth by the Parallel of Doctrines; Therefore the Proteſtants are of the old Religion, and the Papiſts of a new One. For that Religion which doth agree with the oldeſt, and the only Rule is the oldeſt and only Religion; and if the Papiſts will keep to the firſt and ancient Rule, the Word of God, they muſt be of our Religion; if they will not, but add or diminiſh, they will never anſwer to the charge of Novelty laid upon them.

So that their inſulting and ridiculous Queſtion ſo often uſed, even till it is become odious and doth nauſeate, *Where was your Religion before Luther?* (which is the ſecond part of my Task) is plainly and fully reſolved in the Scriptures, and in the Primitive Churches. And methinks learned Papiſts ſhould bluſh and be aſhamed, (that have or can read the Writings of the Fathers, and determinations of ancient Councils,) to propound ſuch a Queſtion; but they do it to amuſe the common People that cannot read *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, and are not acquainted with the Hiſtory of the Church; whileſt I am perſwaded they themſelves know better, and could reſolve this queſtion themſelves, if they would read indifferently and judg impartially. But the

People that cannot read the Fathers, Councils, *&c.* might be abundantly ſatisfied, that our Religion is the old Religion, becauſe found in, and founded upon the Word of God; for all the Books in the World muſt give place to the holy, ſure, infallible Word of the moſt true and faithful God.

But though we ſhew our Doctrines in the Scripture, yet the Queſtion, *Where was our Religion before Luther?* (who began the Reformation in the year 1517.) is put to beget jealouſies in the People, that for many hundred years before him, our Doctrine and Religion was not taught nor profeſſed; and therefore call for a Catalogue of ſuch as have taught our Doctrines from the Apoſtles time ſucceſſively to the time of *Luther*; as they pretend they can do theirs; and would bear the People in hand that the Church as now Reformed, and the Doctrines now received by them, are new and upſtart things, and have not been ſince the Apoſtles times, or before *Luther*; the contrary whereof, that there have been ſuch Doctrines, and a Church owning them in all ages ſince they were preached by the Apoſtles, will appear by two Heads of Arguments; the one taken *a priori*, that ſuch a Church cannot, ſhall not ceaſe, but always be in ſome part or other of the World; the other *a poſteriori*, that it hath not ceaſed, but hath always actually been, and therefore before *Luther*.

The firſt, That it cannot, ſhall not ceaſe to be, taken *a priori* ſtands firm upon theſe two grounds; Firſt, *upon the promiſe of Chriſt*, that is of Infallible Verity; Chriſt hath promiſed that the true Church which is built upon the Doctrine of the Scripture, and is conformed thereunto ſhould continue always, and not fail: That the Reformed Churches are built upon the Doctrine of the Scriptures, and are conformed thereunto, appeareth from the Parallel of Doctrines before laid down. So that there is evidence from the Promiſe of Chriſt, that the Church holding ſuch Doctrines as the Reformed Churches do, did continue, could not fail; and there our Church and Religion was before *Luther*.

Secondly, *Upon the Relation between Chriſt and his Church*; Chriſt is the only *Head* of the Church, and the Church the Body of Chriſt. Chriſt is the *King* of his Church, and the Church ſubject to Chriſt. Chriſt is the *Husband and Bridegroom* of the Church, and the Church the Wife and Spouſe of Chriſt; ſuch a Church then could not ceaſe to be, elſe there would have been ſome time in which Chriſt would have been an *Head without any body* upon Earth, *a King without Subjects*, *an Husband and Bridegroom*, *without a Wife or Spouſe*; all which are abſurd, as to ſay a Man is a Father that hath no Child. But in this the Controverſie doth not lie betwixt us, but which Church is this Body, Subjects, and Spouſe of Chriſt, which by virtue of Chriſts promiſe and relation to him, could not fail or ceaſe to be, theirs, or ſuch as the Reformed Churches are. There is this ground (among others) on our ſide. That Church which owneth Chriſt to be her only Head, Husband and King, and no other

other, which owneth and profeſſeth ſubjection to the Laws of Chriſt, and no other as neceſſary to Salvation, and worſhippeth the true God according to the Scripture, and no other, is the Body, Spouſe and Subjects of Chriſt, that could not ceaſe to be in any age; But ſuch Churches as the Reformed are, do own Chriſt to be their only Head, Husband and King, and no other, and profeſs ſubjection to the Laws of Chriſt, and no other as neceſſary to Salvation, and worſhip God according to the Rules contained in the Scripture, and no other. All which the *Roman* Church as Papal doth not do; for they own another Head beſides Chriſt, as neceſſary to Salvation, and profeſs Subjection to the Laws of another, beſides the Laws of Chriſt, and that equally with them, yea before them, though diſtinct from, and contrary thereunto, and give Religious Worſhip to others beſides the true God, and ſo plays the Whore and Harlot; that we might conclude, that ſuch Churches as the Reformed are, and not as Papal, are the Body, Subjects and Spouſe of Chriſt, which could not ceaſe in any age to be, ſince the Apoſtles times, and there our Religion was, and Church too before *Luther*.

The ſecond evidence that there have been the ſame Doctrines, neceſſary to Salvation, taught all along ſince the Apoſtles ſucceſſively to *Luthers* times, is *a poſteriori*, from the Writings of Men, and Hiſtories of the Church, even ſuch as are abundantly ſatisfactory to us and undeniable by our adverſaries, that our Doctrines are not ſo late as *Luther*. I had here prepared ſeveral things to be inſerted concerning the Succeſſion of the Church from the Primitive times, to the age in which we live; but becauſe I would not have this Diſcourſe to ſwell above the bounds of a Sermon, and underſtanding that there is a Reverend Brother deſired to treat of that particularly, to which I do refer you, I here omit them; yet the frequent demand of Papiſts, asking, *Where was your Religion before Luther?* and that part of this preſent Poſition, That it was before *Luther*, will not ſuffer a total ſilence herein. Though this is no real prejudice to the Truth of our Doctrine, or Religion, if we could not give a Catalogue of names that did hold and profeſs them in all ages, ſo long as we find them in the Scripture, nor could they for want thereof be juſtly charged, either with falſity or novelty; for what is in the Word of God is true and old, and what is not contained therein and made neceſſary to Salvation, is falſe and new, though of many hundred years ſtanding. That this is unreaſonably required by the Papiſts, no hurt to our Religion, as to the Verity and Antiquity of it, nor no cauſe of ſtumbling to the common People, familiarly aſſaulted in this point, and all becauſe not neceſſary to be known, will appear by theſe things following.

1. *It is not neceſſary to prove our ſelves to be men to give an account of all the names of all the men that have lived before us, no, nor of any of them.* It is ſufficient hereunto that we can prove we have the ſame Eſſential Con-

Conſtitutive parts of Men as our Predeceſſors had; that we have ſuch Bodies and ſuch Souls as they had, is a proof we are real Men as they were, though we know not the names of all the Intermediate perſons ſucceſſively by whom we have received our Beings from them: would not you laugh at one that would perſwade you, you are no Men, or that the Humane nature is a new thing, becauſe you cannot give a Catalogue of the names of Men from *Adam*, or from *Noah*, from one age to another? or would it not be ſufficient proof of your Manhood that you have the ſame Identity of Nature as *Adam* or *Noah*, and Men of former ages had? So here; ſo long as we can tell and are ſure we own and believe the ſame Doctrines that the Apoſtles did, we are ſure we are of the ſame Religion as they were, though we could not give the names of the perſons that have from time to time profeſſed the ſame, this is as if one ſhould ſay *Melchizedek* did not ſucceed his Progenitors, becauſe his Genealogy cannot be given. Ridiculous!

2. *It is not neceſſary to know the falſeneſs of any Doctrine that we ſhould know the names of the Hereticks that have handed them down from one age to another*; but we know them to be falſe, by their being contrary to the Scripture.

3. *We know that the dictates of the Law of nature are good and true, and that we have ſuch a Law though we cannot give an account of the name of our Anceſtors from whom we have received them.*

4. *A man might be an exact artificer, though he be not able to mention the names of thoſe that have been in all ages, that profeſſed the ſame occupation from the times of thoſe that did firſt invent them.* So a man might be a good Chriſtian, and of the true Religion, and be ignorant of the many thouſands Chriſtians that have been before him.

5. *Without this knowledg a man might love God, repent, believe and be ſaved*, therefore not neceſſary to true Doctrine, Religion or Salvation; elſe every unlearned Believer muſt be acquainted with all the Hiſtories of the Church, and Fathers, and Profeſſors before him, which is impoſſible.

6. *If a man did know this, yet he might be damned*, if a man could tell all the Writers, Preachers, Doctors and Councils that have lived this Sixteen hundred years he might go to Hell at laſt. God will condemn men for being ignorant of the Eſſential Points in Chriſtianity contained in the Scripture, and if they do not believe, nor are converted; but not for being unacquainted with the Hiſtories of the Church, and names of thoſe that did profeſs the true Religion in the ages before them.

7. *The Scripture never denieth that to be a true Church, that cannot, and becauſe it cannot ſhew the ſucceſſion thereof by Hiſtories and Humane Writings.*

8. *The Scripture doth never ſend us to Hiſtories, Councils and Fathers to judg of true Doctrine and Religion by, but to the Word of God.* Where in Scripture are Profeſſors or Miniſters either commanded to ſtudy, and be ſo converſant in all Hiſtories, Councils and Antiquities as to be able

to

to give a Catalogue, who have taught or owned the true Doctrine in ages before them?

9. *What deceitful dealing is this?* to deny the People the reading of the Scripture and acquaintance with them, and in such things commend Ignorance as the Mother of Devotion, and will yet call upon them to say, Who taught your Doctrines before *Luther?* as if it were more material to know who taught them, than to know them; or to be more skilled in the Writings of Men, than in the Word of God.

10. *They call for that from us on our part, which they cannot give themselves for themselves on their part.* You ask, Who taught your Doctrines from the Apostles times? and we retort your Question, and who taught all your Doctrines from the Apostles times? We know you can never shew them. So that if we could not, yet we were even with you. I know you pretend a large Catalogue of Popes; but yet you are greatly puzzled to give their Succession, when there have been several Popes together, and they that then lived could not know which was the right. But if you could give a *Succession* of *Persons*, it profits nothing without a *Succession of true Doctrine*; if you could shew a Succession *de facto*, you can shew none *de jure*. That may be actual that may not be lawful. A thief may actually succeed a true Possessor, and a Tyrant and Usurper a lawful Prince, but not lawfully; this is Usurpation not legitimate Succession. We might say therefore to your People as you do to ours. Is it safe for you to continue in that Religion, of which you can give no account who have taught your Doctrines from the Apostles times? for you cannot, no, nor your Doctors neither, no, though they call a Council and search all Records and Writings of men, as shall be shewn in the next General Head of this Sermon.

Yet this is not said, as if we doubted of our cause, if it were to be tried by the Writings of the ancient Fathers, or as if we could not mention multitudes before *Luther* that have taught and owned our Doctrines; for there are many great Volumns and Cart-loads of Books in which our Doctrines are to be found. To give a large rehearsal of their words on our side would be an endless work, and not to be crouded into a piece of one Sermon: yet a few shall be picked out of many, sufficient to shew that our Doctrines, in which we do oppose the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome* have been taught of old.

What was the Doctrine in the first hundred year from the Birth of Christ is best understood from the holy Scripture; and this is that Age and the Writings of the Apostles are those Writings, by which the Writings of all other Ages must be examined, as their surest Rule, and that our Doctrines are there contained, and not the Doctrines of the Papists as such; see the Parallel before.

In the Writings of the Fathers that lived in the second hundredth year we have many Testimonies.

In this Age the Bishop of *Rome* had not that Power as now they chal-

challenge, as appears from a Letter of *Eleutherius* Bishop of *Rome* to *Lucius* King of *England* (r), who had sent to the Bishop for the *Roman* Laws, as they were framed in Religion, to whom is sent an answer by *Eleutherius*, *Ye require of us the* Roman *Laws, and the Emperours to be sent over to you.*-----*The* Roman *Laws and the Emperours we may ever reprove, but the Law of God we may not. Ye have received of late through Gods mercy in the Realm of* Brittany *the Law and Faith of Christ, ye have with you within the Realm, both the parts of the Scripture, out of them by Gods Grace with the Council of your Realm take ye a Law, and by that Law (through Gods sufferance) rule your Kingdom of* Britain; *for you be Gods Vicar in your Kingdom.*-----Afterwards, *whose Vicar you be in the Realm.* From whence is clear, that this Bishop of *Rome* (1) challenged not the Supremacy over *England*, but acknowledg'd the King to be Supream Governour in his own Kingdom. (2) That he acknowledged the Perfection of Scripture for life and manners, when Laws should be taken from thence for the Government of a Kingdom. (3) That *England* received the Gospel early, and not so late from the Church of *Rome* as some of them boast, nor at all first from them but from the *Græcians* of the East-Church (s), as some think.

(r) Fox. Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 139.

(s) Id. ibid. p. 138.

Particulars would be abundance, but Brevity is one part of my task in this present matter; I must therefore take up with a Testimony or two of the Doctrine taught in this Age. (t) *Irenæus* testifieth that the same Truths of Apostolical Doctrine were in this Age.-----(u) And that the Church that was planted through a great part of the World, even to the end of the Earth, by the Apostles and their Disciples, received the same Faith that is contained in that which is called the Apostles Creed; and he gives a Summary of Doctrines to the same purpose as in that Creed is contained.

(t) Iren. adver. hæres. lib. 3. Id. lib. 1. c. 2.

(u) Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. 3. c. 24.

Unto these times (w) *Egesippus* that lived in this Age, declareth that the Church of God remained a pure and uncorrupted Virgin.----Moreover the same witness gives a general Testimony of the Doctrine in this Age,-----coming to *Rome* he met with many Bishops, of one mind and Doctrine, saith, The Church of *Corinth* remains in the pure and right Rule of Doctrine, and was comforted very much with their Doctrine. Being come to *Rome* I staid there till *Anicetus* was stalled Bishop,-----in all the Succession, and in every one of their Cities, it is no otherwise than the Law and Prophets, and the Lord himself did preach.

(w) Egesip. apud. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. c. 21.

After the Apostles many taught our Doctrines long before *Luther*: having but little room, I must take up with the fewer Heads of Doctrine, and fewer Testimonies under each Doctrine; I had begun to give a Catalogue in every hundred year since Christ, but that being too large for this place, I laid it by, and give Instances in these few following.

I. *The*

I. *The Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture to Salvation taught long before Luther.*

(x) *Justin Martyr*, who lived in the second hundredth year after Christ, writeth, That the *true Religion is contained in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, who have taught all things necessary for us to know; we are not commanded to give credit to the Traditions and Doctrines of men, but those Doctrines which were published by the Prophets, and Christ himself delivered; all things are to be brought to the Scripture, and from thence are arguments and proofs to be fetched; for if a man be never so often asked, how many doth two times two make? he will still say, four; so a Christian discoursing with others will always alledg the Scripture.* (y) And *Irenæus*, "The Scriptures are perfect as spoken and dictated from the Word of "Godand his Spirit.

So *Tertullian*, (z) An. Dom. 200, *&c.* writes, "I adore the fulness of the "Scriptures.------Let *Hermogenes* shew that it is written, if it be not "written, let him fear that wo appointed for those that add, or dimi-"nish. In another place, thus, (a) "We have the Apostles of the "Lord for our Authors; which never brought in any thing at their "own will, but what Doctrine they had from Christ, they faithfully "delivered to the Nations; wherefore if an Angel from Heaven should "preach otherwise to us, we would pronounce him accursed.----To (b) this Objection [*the Apostles did not know all or if they did, they did not deliver all*] he replieth, "That both ways such reproach Christ as "if he had sent Apostles either unskilful, or unfaithful.----Again, "In "matters of Faith, men must argue no other way than from the Scrip-"tures. In short, he lays down the Doctrines of this Age in a Confes-sion of Faith, agreeable to (that which is called) the Apostles Creed, and saith, They are not doubted of by any amongst us, but Hereticks. In the like manner speaketh *Origen*, (c) that lived also in this Age, of the Perfection of the Scripture: "In the two Testaments every word "that appertaineth to God may be required and discussed, and all know-"ledg of things out of them may be understood; but if any thing do "remain, which the holy Scripture doth not determine, no other third "Scripture ought to be received for to authorize any knowledg. And more in other places *; and a large Confession of Faith also by him, and *Gregory Neocæsar*, containing the Doctrines that we hold. (d)

(x) Just. Mar. in Tryph. & Paren.

(y) Scripturæ perfectæ sunt, quippe à verbo Dei & Spiritu ejus dictæ. *Iren.* adver. hær. lib. 2. cap. 47.

(z) Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem — Scriptum esse, doceat Hermogenis Officina, si non est Scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus, aut detrahentibus destinatum. *Tertul.* adver. *Hermog.*

(a) Apostolos Domini habemus authores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex suo arbitrio, quod inducerent, elegerant; sed acceptam à Christo Disciplinam fideliter Nationibus assignaverunt. Itaque etiamsi Angelus de cœlis aliter Evangelizaret, anathema diceretur à nobis. Idem de Præsc. Hæret.

(b) Solent dicere,——non omnia Apostolos scisse,——omnia quidem Apostolos scisse; sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse; in utroq; Christum reprehensioni subjicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices Apostolos miserit. *Ibid.* Aliunde suadere non possent de rebus fidei nisi ex literis fidei. *Ibid.* (c) Id. ibid. *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. 5. Tom. 1. * Hom. 2. in *Hieremiam.*

(d) Magdeburg. Cent 3. p. 34, 35.

(e) *Hierome* that died *An.* 420. thus, "Whatsoever we affirm, we "ought to prove out of the holy Scriptures, the speakers words have

(i) Hieron. in Psal. 98.

"not ſo much Authority as the Lords Command.

(f) Nihil, vel cautionis gratiâ jungere nos debemus mandato. Si quid enim vel addas, vel detrahas, prævaricatio quædam videtur eſſe mandati, pura enim & ſimplex mandati forma ſervanda.—Nihil vel quod bonum videtur, addendum eſt.—Docet igitur nos præſentis lectionis ſeries neq; detrahere aliquid divinis debere mandatis, neq; addere. *Ambr. Tom.* 4. *de Paradiſ. cap.* 12.

(f) *Ambroſe* alſo who was born about the year 333, is of the ſame judgment. "We ought to add nothing, no, not for caution to "Gods Command; for if thou doſt add, or diminiſh, it is a prevaricating "of the Command; the pure and ſimple form of the Command is to "be kept.----Nothing therefore, ſeem it never ſo good, ought to be "added to it.----Therefore we ought not to add to or take away from "the Commands of God. And he is more large which I cannot (for brevity) tranſcribe. (g) Again, he ſaith, "Who ſhall ſpeak where the "Scripture is ſilent? *Auguſtine* (born *An.* 355.) ſubſcribes the ſame Doctrine. (b) "In thoſe things which are laid down plainly in the "Scripture, all thoſe things are found which belong to Faith, or di-"rection of life.----(i) "Let us not hear, this I ſay, this you ſay, but "let us hear, this ſaith the Lord; there is Gods Book, to whoſe Autho-"rity we on both ſides conſent, believe, there let us ſeek the Church, "there let us diſcuſs our cauſe. Let thoſe things be taken from amongſt "us which we quote, or alledg one againſt another, but not from the "Divine Canonical Books; for I will not, that the holy Church be de-"monſtrated from the Documents of Men, but from the Oracles of "God. Again, "Read us theſe things out of the Law, out of the Pro-"phets, or Pſalms, or Goſpel, or the Apoſtles Epiſtles; read ye, and "we believe.----Again, our Lord Jeſus himſelf did rather judg that his "Diſciples ſhould be confirmed by the Teſtimony of the Law and "Prophets. Theſe be the proofs, foundation, and ſtrength of our "cauſe.----Again, "Let no man ask me my opinion, but let us hear-"ken to the Scripture, and ſubmit our petty reaſonings to the Word "of God.----We walk much ſafer according to the Scripture; Con-"troverſies are to be determined by the Scripture.------Again, I inſert "the opinion of *Ambroſe*, *Jerome*, &c. not for that thou ſhouldſt think "that the ſenſe of any man is to be followed as the Authority of Cano-"nical Scripture. *Auguſtine* hath abundance more (in many places) of "ſuch-like Doctrine, and he was above a thouſand years before *Luther*.

(g) Sanctis Scripturis non loquentibus, quis loquetur? *Idem. de Voc. Gent. l.* 2. *c.* 3.

(b) In iis quæ aperte in Scriptura poſita ſunt, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreſq; vivendi. *Aug. de Doct. Chriſt. Tom.* 3. *L.* 2. *c.* 9. (i) Non audiamus, hæc dico, hæc dicis, ſed audiamus, hæc dicit dominus. Sunt certe libri Dominici, quorum autoritati, utriq; conſentimus, utriq; credimus, — Ibi quæramus Eccleſiam, ibi diſcutiamus cauſam noſtram; auferantur illa de medio, quæ adverſus nos invicem, non ex divinis Canonicis libris, ſed aliunde recitamus; quia nolo humanis documentis, ſed divinis oraculis ſanctam Eccleſiam demonſtrari. *Idem de unitat. Eccleſ. cap.* 3. Legite nobis hæc de Lege, de Prophetis, de Pſalmis, de ipſo Evangelio, de Apoſtolicis literis; Legite & credimus. *Idem. Ibid. cap.* 6. Ipſe dominus Jeſus diſcipulos teſtimoniis Legis & Prophetarum confirmandos eſſe magis judicavit. Hæc ſunt cauſæ noſtræ documenta, hæc fundamenta, hæc firmamenta. *Idem. Ibid. cap.* 16. Nemo ex me quærat ſententiam meam, ſed potius audiamus oracula, noſtraſq; ratiunculas divinis ſummittamus affatibus. *Auguſt. de Mor. Eccl. Cath. cap.* 7. *Tom.* 1. Per Scripturas Divinas multo tutius ambulatur. Controverſia ex eadem Scriptura terminetur. *Id. de Doct. Chriſt. cap.* 8. Sententias Ambroſii, Hieronymi, &c. non ob hoc interponere volui, ut cujuſquam hominis ſenſum tanquam Scripturæ Canonicæ auctoritatem ſequendum arbitreris. *Id. Epiſt.* 112.

Chryſoſtome

Chryſoſtome alſo, that lived in the ſame age, and died about the year 407, taught the ſame Doctrine ſo long before *Luther*, in this point, as the Reformed Churches now do. Thus he writes: (*k*) "Would it not be "an abſurd and prepoſterous thing, that when we have to do with men "in matters of money, we believe them not, but count it after them; but "when we are to judg of things, we are ſimply drawn into their opi-"nions; and that when we have the Law of God for an exact rule, ba-lance and ſquare of all things. Wherefore I beſeech and intreat you all, "that ye matter not, what one or another thinks of theſe things; but "that ye would conſult the holy Scriptures concerning them. In ano-ther place thus: (*l*) "Theſe things which are in the holy Scripture are "clear and right; whatſoever is neceſſary, is manifeſt therein. Many more Teſtimonies we might have from this Author, and others quoted in the Margent, (*m*) but Brevity forbids the tranſcribing of their words. To conclude this particular take the Teſtimony of a Council, (*n*) wherein are many witneſſing together, that the Scripture is ſo per-fect that nothing is to be added to it. *Ambroſe* ſaid, "Anathema to "him, that addeth any thing to the Scripture, or taketh from it, and "all the Biſhops ſaid, let him be accurſed. And their own Canon Law, (*o*) reciting the words of *Cyprian*, That the Scripture muſt be followed, and not Cuſtom or Traditions. "If Chriſt only is to be heard, we "ought not to regard what any one before us thought was to be done; "but what Chriſt that was before all did; neither ought we to follow "the cuſtom of men, but the truth of God; when as the Lord hath "ſaid by the Prophet *Iſaias*, *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching the "commands and doctrine of men.* And again, (*p*) "It is not lawful for "the Emperour, or any other perſon piouſly diſpoſed, to preſume any "thing againſt the Divine precepts, nor to do any thing that is con-"trary to the Rules of the Evangeliſts, Prophets, or Apoſtles. Then their Writings muſt be perfect, or we ſhall often be at a loſs for want of a Rule to direct us. All theſe and multitudes more taught this long before *Luther*.

(*k*) Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον ὑπὲρ μὲν χρημάτων μὴ εἰκῇ πείθεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀριθμῷ καὶ ζυγῷ τοῦτο ἐπιζητεῖν, ὑπὲρ δὲ πραγμάτων ἁπλῶς ταῖς ἐκείνων γνώμαις ἕπεσθαι; διὰ ταῦτα ἐκτείνω ζυγὸν ἀκριβῆ καὶ γραμμὴν καὶ κανόνα, τῶν θείων νόμων τὴν ἀκρίβειαν; διὸ παρακαλῶ καὶ λίσσομαι πάντων ὑμᾶς, ἀφεῖναι τί τῷ δεῖνι καὶ τῷ δεῖνι δοκεῖ τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ τί παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν ταῦτα ἀκριβῶς πυνθάνεσθε. Chryſ. Hom. 13. in 2 Cor.

(*l*) Ταῦτα σαφῆ καὶ εὐθέα καὶ διάφορα πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν. Athanaſ. Tom. 1. pag. 1. Ἡ μὲν ἀληθὴς καὶ εὐσεβὴς εἰς τὸν κύριον πίστις φανερὰ πᾶσι καθέστηκεν ἐκ τῆς θείων γραφῶν γινωσκομένη τε καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη. Idem. Tom. 1. 398. Ἡ θεία γραφὴ πάντων ἱκανωτέρα. Idem. pag. 114. vide etiam pag. 217. 428. Τὰ μὲν σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς δέχεσθαι, τὰ δὲ ἀλλότρια καταβάλλειν. Baſil. Mag. in Moral. lib. Sum. 72. cap. 1. Vide etiam eundem. Sum. 80. cap. 22. & Homil. de Confeſ. fidei. & paſſim. (*n*) Concil. Aquilcien. Surius. Tom. 1. de Concil. p. 477. (*o*) Corp. Jur. Can. Diſtinct. 8. c. ſi Solus. (*p*) Ibid. Diſtinct. 10. c. non licet.

II. *That the People ought to read the Scripture, and therefore ought it to be tranſlated into vulgar Tongues, was a Doctrine taught long before* Luther.

(q) Ἀκούσατε ὅσοι ἐστὲ κόσμικοι καὶ γυναικὰς καὶ παῖδας περίεστε, πῶς καὶ ὑμῖν ἐπιτέτακε μάλιστα πάντας χαράξαι ἀναγινώσκειν. Καὶ ἐν ἀγορᾷ οὐδὲν ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀκριβείας,—Ἀκούσατε, παρακαλῶ, πάντες οἱ βιωτικοὶ καὶ κλάσατε βιβλία φέρματα τῆς ψυχῆς. Τοῦτο πάντων, αὐτὸν τῶν ναῶν, τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι τὰς γραφάς. Χωρὶς ὅπλων εἰς πόλεμον βαδίζομεν καὶ πῶς ἔχει σωθῆναι, &c. Chryſoſt. in Coloſſ. Homil. 9. Item in Mat. Homil. 2. in Mat. Hom. 5. to this purpoſe alſo, de Lazar. Hom. 3. in Geneſ. Homil. 29. In Johan. Homil. 1.

By *Chryſoſtome*, (q) "Let the Word of God dwell in you richly, he "doth not ſay, only let it dwell in you, but in great abundance. Hear "this ye worldly men, that have Wives and Children, how he com- "mandeth you to read the Scriptures, and that not ſlightly, but with "all diligence.----Hear this I pray you all ye that are careful about the "things of this life, and get you Bibles, which are the medicines of "your Souls. Ignorance of the Scriptures is the cauſe of all evils. We "go to war without our weapons, how then can we be ſafe? &c. In another place he inſtructed the People, "That when they went from "the Congregation to their Houſes, they ſhould take their Bibles and "call their Wives and Children to participate of the Diſcourſe of the "things that were ſaid. And in another place, he exhorts them dili- gently to attend the reading of the holy Scripture, "Not only when "they came to the Aſſembly, but at home to take the Sacred Scrip- "tures into their hands, and this he doth by an argument drawn from "the great profit that they may receive thereby. Elſewhere he alſo "mentioneth that the *Syrians*, *Egyptians*, *Indians*, *Perſians*, *Ethiopians*, and multitudes more, had the Doctrines of the Scripture tranſlated into their own Tongues.

(r) Aug. de Doct. Chriſt. lib. 2. cap 5.

The like alſo by Saint *Auguſtine*, (r) "It is come to paſs that the "Scripture, wherewith ſo many diſeaſes of mens wills are holpen, pro- "ceeding from one Tongue which fitly might be diſperſed through "the world, being ſpread far and wide by means of the divers Lan- "guages whereinto it is tranſlated, is thus made known to Nations "for their Salvation, the which when they read, they deſire nothing "elſe but to attain, to the mind of him that wrote it, and ſo to the "will of God, according to which we believe ſuch men ſpake.

(s) Hoſ. de Expreſ. Dei verb.

(t) Theodoret. de curand. Græco. affect. lib. 5.

To the new Doctrine of *Hoſius* Preſident (s) at the Council of *Trent*, *That a Diſtaff was fitter for Women than a Bible*; We will oppoſe (t) the Teſtimony of *Theodoret* of the old practice in the Church in this point: "You ſhall every where ſee theſe Points of our Faith to be known and "underſtood, not only by ſuch as are teachers in the Church, but even "of Coblers, and Smiths, and Webſters, and all kind of Artificers; yea "all our Women, not they only which are Book-learned, but they "alſo that get their living with their Needle, yea Maid-ſervants, and "waiting Women; and not Citizens only but Husbandmen of the "Country are very skilful in theſe things; yea, you may hear among "our Ditchers, and Neat-heards, and Wood-ſetters diſcourſing of the "Trinity and Creation, &c.

III. *That*

III. *That Religious Worship was not to be given to Images, or Reliques of Saints was taught long before* Luther.

When *Polycarpus* suffered, the envious Persecutors not willing that his Body should be honourably buried, as the Christians were desirous to do, they moved the *Proconsul* not to deliver to the Christians the Body of *Polycarp*, lest they leaving Christ, fall a worshipping of him; concerning which the Church of *Smyrna* (for I have not room for citations of particular persons) in their (*u*) Epistle to the Church at *Philomilium*, &c. said, *This they said, being ignorant of this that we can never forsake Christ,-----and that we can worship no other; for we worship Christ as the Son of God, the Martyrs we love as Disciples and followers of the Lord.*-----

(*u*) Euseb. Eccles. Histor. Lib. 4. cap. 15.

(*w*) About the time of *Sylvester* first, who was *Ann.* 314. a Council was so far from worshipping of Images that they would not have any Pictures in the Churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored should be painted on Walls. Also about the year 700, a Synod at *Constantinople* (whom the *Greeks* call the Seventh,) *did not only condemn the worship of Images, but also Images themselves, and that they should be cast out of Churches.* (*x*) *Gregory* Bishop of *Neocæsarea* (not the antient of that title, but another since him), wrote a Book against Images, which was read and approved by this Council, and inserted into the Synodical Acts as a common Decree; in which Book there are Testimonies of Scripture and Fathers against the Idolatry of Images; and that they would not allow any Image or Picture of Christ, but Anathematized them that should draw his Effigies in material colours. *Can.* 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. and determined that there was one only Image appointed by Christ, to wit, the Blessed Bread and Wine in the Eucharist [Lords Supper] which represent to us the Body and Blood of Christ. The Second *Nicene* Synod was against this, and for Images, and a Synod at *Francfort* against the Second *Nicene* Council and their Images.

(*w*) Placuit, picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere; ne quod colitur, aut Adoratur, in parietibus depingatur. *Concil. Elibr. Can.* 36.

(*x*) Illiric. Catal. Test. Verit. pag. 73, 74.

Pezelius gives us this account, That *Leo* the third, Emperour, called a Synod about the year 730, in which it was controverted, whether Images were to be worshipped, &c. the issue whereof was that the Fathers then present, (except only *Germanus*, and therefore resigned, and one *Anastasius* was chosen in his room) condemned and subscribed, That worshipping of Images and Relicks was meer Idolatry, contrary to the Scripture, and the Intercession of Saints a Fable. The Emperour put the Decrees of the Synod into execution, commanded the Images to be brought into the midst of the City and burned; and the Pictures on Walls to be whited over, and so defaced; and did write to Pope *Gregory* the third, (according to some, the second) and commanded him, as he would keep in his favour, to do the like. After him his Son *Constantinus*, called *Copronymus*, out of his zeal called a Synod at *Byzantium*, Ann. 754. which is called the Seventh General Council, where were present 338 Fathers, where the Question being discussed, Whether

Whether it were lawful that Images ſhould [ſo much as] be in Churches; who receiving the Decrees of the firſt and ſecond Councils of *Conſtantinople*, *Epheſus*, *Nice*, *Chalcedon*; did determine with one conſent, that all Images ſhould as abominations be caſt away. *Pezel. & Lampad. Melliſic. Hiſtor. par.*3. *pag.*37,41.

IV. *That Invocation of Angels and Saints is unlawful was taught long before Luther.*

By the Council of *Laodicea* which was about the year 364, according to *Caranza*, who relating the Canon I am to produce, for [*Angelos*] reads twice [*Angulos*] to evade the force of the Councils Canon, which he could not ſtand before, for which tricks of Legerdemain their Tranſlations are little to be truſted to; let us take it in the *Greek* Text.

(y) Chriſtians ought not to forſake the Church of God, and go and call upon Angels, and gather Aſſemblies, which are forbidden; if therefore any ſhall be found giving himſelf to this ſecret Idolatry, let him be accurſed, becauſe he hath forſaken our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, and hath approached to Idolatry.

(y) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ χριστιανὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπιέναι καὶ ἀγγέλους ἐπονομάζειν καὶ, συνόδους ποιεῖν, ἅπερ ἀπηγορεύθησαν. Εἴ τις οὖν εὑρεθῇ τοῦτο τῷ κεκρυμμένῃ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ κολλῶν ἔστω ἀνάθεμα. Ὅτι ἐγκαταλείπειν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ προσῆλθεν. Concil. Laodic. Can. 35. Codice Canonum Eccleſ. univerſ. Can. 139.

The Papiſts are ſo humble that they will go to God, by having recourſe to Saints, to intercede for them; this we diſlike. Who taught the contrary before *Luther?* Multitudes. One of which becauſe it is ſo pat, I will tranſcribe; (z) *Ambroſe* above a thouſand years ago condemned ſuch that uſed *ſuch a miſerable excuſe, in that they think to go to God by theſe, as men go to a King by his Nobles. Go to, is any man ſo mad or ſo unmindful of his Salvation as to give the Kings honour to a Courtier; which if any do, are they not righteouſly condemned as guilty of Treaſon? and yet theſe do not think themſelves to be guilty, which give the honour of the name of God unto a creature, and forſaking the Lord they adore their fellow-ſervants: For therefore do men go to the King by Tribunes or Officers, becauſe the King is but a man, and knoweth not to whom to commit the ſtate of the Commonwealth; but to procure the favour of God, (from whom nothing is hid, for he knoweth the works of all men) we need no ſpokeſman but a devout mind; for whereſoever ſuch a one ſhall ſpeak unto him, he will anſwer him.*

(z) Solent tamen pudore paſſi neglecti Dei, miſerâ uti excuſatione, dicentes per iſtos poſſe ire ad Deum, ſicuti per Comites pervenitur ad Regem. Age, nunquid tam demens eſt aliquis, aut ſalutis ſuæ immemor, ut honorificentiam Regis vendicet Comiti, cum de hac re ſi qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur Majeſtatis? & iſti ſe non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deſerunt creaturæ, & relicto domino conſervos adorant. —— Nam ideo ad Regem per Tribunos aut Comites itur, quia homo utiq; eſt Rex, & neſcit quibus debeat Rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem (quem utiq; nihil latet, omnium enim merita novit) promerendum ſuffragatore non opus eſt, ſed mente devota. Ubicunque enim talis loquutus fuerit ei, reſpondebit illi. *Ambroſ. in Roman. c.*1.

V. *That*

V. *That there are but two places for the Souls of men after death, and conſequently no Purgatory was taught long before* Luther.

(a) *Auguſtine*, born above a thouſand years before *Luther*, taught, "That there is no middle place for any, he muſt needs be with the "Devil that is not with Chriſt. (b) Again, "The Catholick Faith "reſting upon Divine Authority, believes the firſt place the Kingdom of "Heaven; and the ſecond, Hell; a third we are wholly ignorant of. (c) Again, what *Abraham* ſaith to the Rich man in *Luke*, "That the "Righteous though they would, cannot go to the place where the "Wicked are tormented; what doth it mean, but that the godly can "afford no help of mercy, though they would, to thoſe that be ſhut "up in priſon after this life, that they ſhould come out from thence, "and that through the unchangeableneſs of Gods Judgment. Again, "There is no place for the amending of our ways but in this life; for "after this life every one ſhall receive according to what he ſeeketh "after in this; therefore the love of Mankind doth conſtrain us to in-"tercede for ſinners, leſt by puniſhment they ſo end this life, that there "life being ended, their puniſhment never end. (d) Another, "What-"ſoever ſtate or condition, whether good or bad, a man is taken in "when he dieth, ſo muſt he abide for ever, for he ſhall either reſt in "eternal happineſs with the Saints and the Lord Chriſt, or ſhall be tor-"mented in darkneſs with the Wicked and the Devil. This cannot be Purgatory, for the Papiſts do not ſay that the Wicked, or the Devils be in Purgatory but in Hell.

(a) Auguſt. de pec. Merit. & remiſ. l. 1. c. 28
(b) Idem. Queſt. Evang. lib. 2. cap. 38.
(c) Idem. ad Maced. Epiſt. 54.
(d) Olympiodor. in 11. cap. Eccleſiaſt.

VI. *That the Marriage of Miniſters was lawful, was taught long before* Luther.

Long before indeed; for it is the ſixth of the (ſuppoſed) Apoſtolical Canons, owned by the Church of *Rome* in theſe words, (e) *Let not a Biſhop or a Presbyter upon pretence of Religion put away his Wife; but if he do, let him be excommunicated, if he ſhall perſiſt therein, let him be depoſed.*

(f) The Council at *Ancyra* alſo did decree, *That ſuch as in their Ordination did declare their purpoſe for to marry, if they did ſo, ſhould continue in their Miniſtry.* (g) Another Council about the year 300 decreed, *That if any ſhould judg, that he ought not to partake of the Oblation from a married Presbyter, let him be accurſed.* And the firſt General Council at *Nice* that had this under debate after *Paphnutius* had delivered his judgment about it, did leave it at every Miniſters liberty to marry, or not marry as they ſhould ſee cauſe; (h) which the *Romaniſts* Canon Law doth alſo ſet down. Likewiſe this is fully ſtated in the ſixth General Council, *That the lawful Marriages of holy men ſhould be valid, but whoſoever is found diligent ſhould no way be hindred from that office, becauſe of living with his lawful Wife. Therefore if any ſhall preſume contrary to the Apoſtles Rules to deprive any Presbyters or Deacons, of communion with their lawful Wifes, let him be depoſed.* Well ſaid Council! and if this

(e) Caranz. Sum. Concil. p. 14.
(f) Concil. Ancyran. Can. 10. Codice vero Can. Eccleſ. univerſ. Can. 30.
(g) Codex Can. Eccleſ. univerſ. Can. 63. Concil. Gangrens. Can. 4.
(h) Corp. Jur. Canon. diſtin. 31. c. Nicæna Synodus.

this could have been put into execution, the Pope would have been down long before now, or mended his tyrannical dealings; and yet this stands in their (i) Canon Law, and they act quite contrary to it; here being so many Councils, and so many ancient Fathers in all these Councils I need not look for more, to tell you who taught this Doctrine before *Luther*.

(i) Jus Canon. pars prim. distinct. 31. c. quoniam in Roman.

VII. *Communion in both kinds was taught long before* Luther.

Ignatius, (k) *One bread is broken to all, and one cup distributed to all.* And by *Justin Martyr*, (l) *They give to every one that is present, of the consecrated Bread and Wine, as Christ commanded them.* And by *Cyprian* (m), *How do we invite them to shed their blood for Christ in the Confession of his name, if when they set forth to fight for him, we deny them his blood? how shall we fit them for the cup of Martyrdom, if before we admit them not by right of communion, to drink of the Lords cup in his Church?* In another place thus, (n) *Because some men out of ignorance, or simplicity in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, and ministring it to the People, do not that which Christ the Instituter thereof did and taught, I thought it both matter of Religion and necessity to acquaint you herewith by Letters, that if any be held in that error, the light of truth being now discovered to him, he might return unto the root and beginning of our Lords Institution, &c.* Fully and plainly by *Chrysostom* (o) "That the People have as "good a title to the Cup as the Minister, sometimes and in some things "there is no difference between the People and the Priest, as in the par-"ticipation of the dreadful Mysteries; for all are equally admitted unto "them. In the time of the old Law, it was not lawful for the People to "eat of those things of which the Priests did eat; but it is not so now, "for one body is offered to all, and one Cup.

I must thrust in the Doctrine of *Leo* the Great, who was a Bishop of *Rome*, *Ann.* 440. and yet did count it Sacriledg, not to have the Cup received by the People. He saith thus, speaking of the *Manichees*, (p) "And "when to cover their Infidelity they dare be present at our Mysteries, "they so carry themselves at the Communion of the Sacrament, that "they may the more safely lie hid; they take the Body of Christ "with their unworthy mouths, but they altogether decline the drink-"ing of the Blood of our Redemption; which I would have you to "know that these kind of men by this mark being made manifest, whose "Sacrilegious simulation when discovered, let them be marked, and by "Priestly Authority be driven from the society of the Saints, *&c.*

(k) Εἷς ἄρτος πᾶσιν ἐδείχθη, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμήθη. Ignat. ad Philad.

(l) Διδόασιν ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καθὼς παρέδωκαν αὐτοῖς ἐντεταλθαι οἱ ἀπόστολοι. Just. Apol. 2. in fine.

(m) Cyprian. Epist. 54.

(n) Cyprian. Epist. 63.

(o) Καὶ δήμιος ὢν ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν ἂν μυστηρίων ὁ ἱερεύς, ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἓν σῶμα πρίασθαι, καὶ ποτήριον ἓν. Chrysost. in 2 Cor. Hom. 18.

(p) Cumq; ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse Mysteriis, ita in Sacramentorum Communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant; ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt; Sanguinem autem Redemtionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines, & his manifestentur indiciis, & quorum deprehensa fuerit Sacrilega simulatio, notati & proditi, à Sanctorum societate, Sacerdotali autoritate pellantur, &c. *Leo* 1. *de Quadrages. Serm.* 4.

Be-

Becauſe in Councils there are many witneſſes at once, let us hear them. The Council at *Ancyra*, though but Provincial (yet as *Caranza* ſaith was confirmed by the General Council at *Nice*,) was according to *Caranza* his Computation in the year of our Lord 308, did decree, *Can.* 2. *That Deacons that had ſacrificed to Idols, ſhould not deliver the Bread nor the Cup in the Sacrament.* Whence it appears that in that age the Cup was given as well as the Bread. And the Council at *Neo-cæſarea* confirmed alſo by the *Nicene* Council, (ſo *Caranza*) *Can.* 13. did decree, *That the Country Prieſts in the preſence of the Biſhop, or Presbyters of the City, ſhould not give the Bread, nor reach the Cup, but if they were abſent, they alone ſhould do it.* At the General Council at *Chalcedon* conſiſting of 630 Fathers, the Seventh accuſation brought againſt *Iba* (*q*) Biſhop of *Edeſſa* was, *That there was not ſufficient quantity of Wine provided, that thoſe that did adminiſter were conſtrained to go to the Taverns for more.* But what need this complant, if the People were not to drink as well as to eat; this being a General Council, it ſeems that through the whole Church the Cup was given to the Laity; this was about the year 451. in the time of *Leo* the firſt. In the third *Toletan* Council it was decreed that through all the Churches of *Spain* and *Gallicia*, that the *Creed ſhould be repeated with a loud voice, and the People make profeſſion of their Faith, before they receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* At the Council of *Ilerda*, it was decreed, *That the Clergy that deliver Chriſts Body and Blood, ſhould abſtain from all mens blood, even of their enemies.* One more Teſtimony of one of their Biſhops of *Rome*, full and good Proteſtant Doctrine, which I find in their Decretals. The Doctrine of *Gelaſius* (*r*) who was Biſhop of *Rome*, (for as yet there were no Popes properly as now they uſe the word,) *Ann.* 492. thus, *We have found that certain having received a portion of the ſacred body, abſtain from the Cup of his ſacred Blood, (being intangled with I know not what ſuperſtition) let them either receive the whole Sacrament, or elſe let them be wholly excluded from receiving, becauſe the diviſion of one and the ſelf-ſame Myſtery can't be without grievous Sacriledg.* Well ſaid *Gelaſius!* ye Papiſts that ask who preached our Doctrine before *Luther?* in this point I ſay *Gelaſius*, Biſhop of *Rome*; and he taught of old that the not partaking in both kinds; is 1. Superſtition; 2. a maiming or halfing of the Sacrament; 3. that it is grand Sacriledg. Was your Biſhop in his Chair when he did thus determine; and yet will ye neither believe that he did err, nor yet give the cup to the People, though he did infallibly dictate this to be a duty. Surely he did err in ſaying ſo, or you do err in not doing ſo.

(*q*) Concil. Chalced. apud Surium, Tom. 2. Act. 10.

Concil. Ilerd. Can. 1. apud Magdeburg. Cent. 6. p. 467.

(*r*) Comperimus autem, quod quidam ſumpta tantummodo corporis ſacri portione à Calice ſacri cruoris abſtineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam neſcio qua ſuperſtitione docentur obſtringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia diviſio unius ejuſdemq; Myſterii ſine grandi Sacrilegio non poteſt provenire. *Corpus jur. Can. Decret. pars* 3. *Diſtinct.* 3, *c.* Comperimus autem.

VIII. *That in the Lords Supper after Conſecration there is true and real Bread, and true and real Wine, was a Doctrine taught by many long before* Luther.

By *Tertullian*, (*s*) "Chriſt taking the Bread and diſtributing it to his Diſciples, made it his Body, ſaying, *This is my Body, that is* (mark this) *a figure of my Body.* By *Auguſtine*, (*t*) who bringeth in our Saviour ſpeaking after this manner, "Ye ſhall not eat this Body which "ye ſee, nor drink that Blood which they ſhall ſhed that will crucifie "me: I have commended a certain Sacrament unto you, that being "Spiritually underſtood will quicken you. By *Gelaſius*, (*u*) ſaying, "The Sacraments which we receive of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, "are a Divine Thing, by means whereof we are made partakers of the "Divine Nature, and yet the ſubſtance or nature of Bread and Wine "doth not ceaſe to be, and indeed the image and the ſimilitude of the "Body and Blood of Chriſt are celebrated in the action of the "Myſteries.

(*s*) Hoc eſt corpus meum, "i.e. figura corporis mei. *Tert. adv. Marc. l.* 4.

(*t*) Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi eſtis, & bibituri illum ſanguinem, quem fuſuri ſunt, qui me crucifigent; Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi: Spiritualiter intellectum, vivificabit vos. *Auguſt.* in Pſal. 98. —— (*u*) Certa Sacramenta quæ ſumimus corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti divina res eſt, —— & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura panis & vini. —— *Gelaſ. de duab. Natur. in Chriſt. contra Eutychen.*

By *Ambroſe*, (*w*) "How can that which is Bread by Conſecration "be the Body of Chriſt? by the words of Chriſt: What words of "Chriſt? By which all things were made; the Lord commanded and "the Heaven was made; the Lord commanded, and the Earth, and the "Sea was made. Seeſt thou then how powerful is the Word of Chriſt? "if therefore there be ſuch vertue in the Words of our Lord to make "thoſe things that were not, to begin to be, how much more power"ful is his Word, that they remain the ſame they were, and yet be "changed into another thing?

(*w*) Si ergo tanta vis eſt in Sermone Domini Jeſu, ut inciperent eſſe quæ non erant; quanto magis operatorius eſt, ut SINT QUÆ ERANT & in aliud commutentur? —— Tu ipſe eras, ſed eras vetus creatura, poſteaquam conſecratus es, nova creatura eſſe cæpiſti. —— Sed forte dicis, ſpeciem ſanguinis non video. Sed habet ſimilitudinem. —— Similitudinem precioſi ſanguinis bibis. *Ambroſ. de Sacram, lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. *edit.(mihi)* Paris, 1529.

This Author doth acknowledg a change, but not a Tranſubſtantiating change, for he expreſly ſaith, They be what they were. It was Bread and Wine before, and therefore though ſet apart for holy uſe, yet not changed into another nature. So as to ſubſtance, to ceaſe to be what they were. And he giveth inſtance in our ſelves, when converted there is a change, of old are made new creatures, but not by being changed into a new ſubſtance, but our Souls ſet upon right Objects, *&c.* And when the Objection is made, But I do not ſee Blood in kind. He replieth, But it hath the likeneſs or ſimilitude of it; and thou drinkeſt that which hath the reſemblance of the precious Blood of Chriſt. This was taught then above a thouſand years before *Luther* by this Father. And ſo it was by *Chryſoſtome* alſo, (*x*) Who ſaith, "If "it be perilous to put theſe hallowed Veſſels to private uſe, in which is "not the true Body of Chriſt, but the Myſtery of his Body is contained "therein, how much more, *&c.*

(*x*) Chryſoſt. in Mat. Tom. poſtr. 2. Hom. 11.

IX. *That*

IX. *That the Bishop of Rome was not the Universal Head of the Catholick Church, nor the Judg in whose definitive sentence all were bound to acquiesce was taught long before* Luther.

In the second hundredth year after Christ, there were six Councils, Provincial only, the cause whereof was the difference about the Feast of *Easter*; *Irenæus* (*y*) President of the Synod in *France* did write to *Victor* then Bishop of *Rome*, and sharply reprehended him for going about to sever from the Unity in Communion all the Churches of *Asia*, which pleased not all the Bishops. So *Eusebius*. In the year 418 was the sixth Council of *Carthage*, which resisted three Popes one after another. About the year 450 the Council of *Chalcedon* withstood *Leo* then Bishop of *Rome* in the question of Supremacy.

(*y*) Euseb. Histor. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 23. 25. & lib. 7. cap. 5.

Illyricus upon his word affirmeth that he saw an Epistle of the Bishops of *France* and *Germany* (written by *Aventinus* his own hand) to *Anastasius* Bishop of *Rome*, and others of his Complices, the sum whereof was, *To admonish the Pope and those Bishops of* Italy *that sided with him, to let them alone, and not proceed to exercise their Tyranny over them.* The whole Epistle is to be found in *Illyricus*, *Catal. Test. Verit. pag.* 41.

The Bishops also of *Belgia* about the year 860, did contest with the Pope, whose Epistle to Pope *Nicolas* the first is taken by *Illyricus* out of *Aventinus*, in the close of which Epistle they declare that for the Causes before mentioned: (*z*) "They would not stand to his Decrees, nor "hear his voice, nor fear his thundring Bulls. Thou condemnest them "that obey not the Decrees of the Senate.--------We assault thee with "thine own weapon that despisest the Decree of our Lord God,------- "the holy Spirit is the Author of all the Churches which are spread both "far and near; the City of our God, whose free Denizons we are, is "greater than that City which by the holy Prophets is called *Babylon*. "----which exalts her self to Heaven,-----and doth falsly glory that she "never hath erred nor can err.

(*z*) Hisce de causis, cum fratribus nostris & collegis, neque edictis tuis stamus, neq; vocem tuam agnoscimus, neq; tuas bullas tonitruaq; tua timemus; tu eos qui Senatus Consultis non parent, impietatis condemnas.—— Nos tuo te ense jugulamus, qui edictum Domini Dei nostri conspuis, — Spiritus sanctus autor est omnium Ecclesiarum, qua longissime & latissime terrarum orbis porrigitur. Civitas Dei nostri, cujus municipes sumus, major est urbe, quæ Babylonia à sacris vatibus appellatur, quæ——cœlo se æquat, neq; unquam se erasse, aut errare posse mendaciter gloriatur. *Illyric. Catal. Test. verit. (ex Aventin.) pag.* 80.

Ludovicus the Emperour, Son of *Charles* the Great, and the Nobles and Clergy in his time did not own the Bishop of *Rome* to have that Headship and Power as now they claim and usurp, when by his Authority, without any mention of the Pope, he assembled several Councils; besides others he called four several Synods for the Reformation of the Church of *France*, *viz.* at *Mentz*, at *Paris*, at *Lions*, and at *Tholouse*, to enquire what was held answerable or contrary to the revealed Will of God, and wherein they departed from the holy Scripture. He was

so famous for the Churches good procured by him, that *Platina* bewailing the most horrible wickedness of the Popes and their Clergy in his days, that he cryeth out, *O Ludovice, utinam nunc viveres.* O Ludovicus I wish thou wert now alive. *(a)*

(a) Illyric. Catal. p. 86.

(b) Hincmar Archbishop of *Rhemes* openly published, "That it was "not lawful for the Inferiour Bishops upon any publick or general oc- "casion to consult the Pope, unless they had first advised thereof with "their own Archbishops; that it was needless for Archbishops to ex- "pect resolutions from the See of *Rome* concerning such things that are "already sentenced in holy Scripture, in the Councils, Canons and De- "crees of the Church. And expounded those words, *Tu es Petrus*, thou "art *Peter*, thus; Upon this sure and solid Confession of Faith which "thou hast made, will I build my Church. And as touching the Power "of binding and loosing he did write to the Pope himself, *Leo* the *4th*. "That that Power was passed and derived from St. *Peter*, and from the "rest of the Apostles to all the chief Heads of the Church; and that "St. *Peters* Privileg took place only where men judg according to the "equity of St. *Peter*, and is of force wheresoever that equity is used. If *Luther* had now been born, (as he was not for many hundred years after) this would have been called *Luthers* Doctrine.

(b) Magdeb. Centur. 9. pag. 338. Proceres regni affirmare, inquit, illa nova & inaudita esse, quod Papa vesit sibi de jure Regnorum judicia sumere, non posse eum simul Episcopum & regem esse, &c. *Hincmar. apud Magd. Cen. 9. p. 356.* Monet Pontificem ne tam temere excommunicationes præcipiat. —— Sed patiatur causas diligentius in suis Provinciis cognosci, & juxta Canones dijudicari. *Hincmar. Magd. cen. 9. p. 524.* Luithpert. Otgarius, Guntherus Colonienses, Thetgondus, Treverenses, & alii Episcopi Belgici graviter tyrannidem Rom. Pont. redarguunt. Magd. Cent. 9. p. 338. item Ecclesiæ Græcorum, & Imperatores contra Papam, vide Mag. centur. 9. 340, 341.

Likewise when *Leo* the fourth encroached upon the Church of *Germany*, *Luithpert* Archbishop of *Mence* writing to *Lewis* King of *Germany*, speaks much against the Pope, saying, "That the Churches Head "did ake, and if speedy remedy were not taken, it would quickly distil "upon the Members.

About this time 854, the Church of *Rome* had a sore miscarriage, when Pope *John* alias------not being like to other Males, was great with Child by his, rather her servant, and going to the *Lateran* fell in pieces, a good device to provide for succession, the Pope brings forth a Child; but since that time they have made a hole in Saint *Peters* Chair, that when a new Pope sits down, the Puny Deacon might search of what-----before the one Body of the *Romish* Church had two Heads, the one visible, the other invisible, but now the Head of that Church had two Bodies, and both visible.

(c) *Arnulphus* his Oration at large. See *Magdeb. Cent. 16. p. 486, 487, 488, 489.*

Arnulphus in a Synod held at *Rhemes*, *(c)* noted the Pope to be Antichrist; saying, "What, O Reverend Fathers, what I say think you "him to be, which sitteth thus in a lofty Throne, in Purple Robes, and "glittering Gold? Certainly, if he be void of Charity, lifted and puffed "up only with knowledg, he is Antichrist, sitting in the Temple of "God;

"God; but if he want both Charity and Knowledg, than he is an Idol; "and to seek to him for answer is to enquire of Marble stones.

(d) *Theophylact* Archbishop of the *Bulgarians*, expounding these words, [*Upon this Rock will I build my Church*,] made no mention of the Pope of *Rome*, saying, "That Confession that *Peter* made should become the "foundation of the Faithful, in such sort that every man that would "build the house must necessarily put this Confession for his Foundation.------Of the Power of the Keys he said, "Though it were only said "to *Peter*, *To thee will I give*, &c. yet that Power was once given to all "the Apostles when he said, *Whose sins ye remit, shall be remitted.*

(d) Theoph. in Mat. c. 16. & Joh. 20.

Famous is the History of *Otho*, (e) who assembled a great Synod in the Church of St. *Peter* at *Rome*, of Archbishops, and Bishops in *Rome*, from *Millain*, *Ravenna*, *Germany*, and *France*; to which Pope *John* the thirteenth would not come, to whom a Letter was sent by the Emperour, that he would make his appearance to answer to the things of which he was accused, (and they were very (f) many and very hainous) to which Letter he returned this answer; "I hear say you mean to create "another Pope, which if you do, I Excommunicate you by the Om- "nipotent God, that you have no Power to Ordain any, nor to cele- "brate the Mass. When this Letter was reading comes in the Archbishop of *Trevers*, and other Bishops of *Lorrain*, *Liguria*, and *Æmilia*, with whose advice and counsel the Emperour and Synod sent this Answer, "That they made light of his Excommunication, and they would "return it upon himself; for when *Judas* had become a Murderer, he "could tye none but himself, strangling himself with an Halter.------ *Otho* Deposed Pope *John*, and took into his hands the nominating and making of Popes afterwards. As yet Emperours were not come to wait bare-foot at the Popes Palace, nor to hold their Stirrups.

(e) Magd. Centur. 10. de Synod. pag. 433, &c.

(f) Johannes 13. Venationibus magis quam orationibus vacabat, & multa alia auditu indigna de eo dicuntur. *Caranz.* Sum. Concil. pag. 787. In hoc Concilio, objectis in *Joh.* criminibus, homicidii, perjurii, Sacrilegii, Incestus, aliorumq; nefandorum scelerum, &c. *Luitprand.* apud *Baron.* in Spond. Epitom. in annum 963.

(g) When the Pope *Ann.* 996, sent a Cardinal into *France* to Consecrate a Church there, the Prelates of *France* hearing of it, "Judged it to "be Sacrilegious presumption proceeding from blind Ambition, that he "should transgress Apostolical and Canonical Orders, especially being confirmed by many Authorities.

(g) Glaber. Historiarum lib. 2. cap. 4. Baron. Annales, Ann. 996.

(b) *Gregory* the seventh strictly forbidding Priests to Marry, writeth to the Princes of *Germany*, That they would not frequent the Masses of

(b) Adversus *Hildebrandi* Decretum (quo magna severitate Sacerdotum conjugium damnabat per universum Christianum orbem) infremuit tota factio clericorum; hominem plane hæreticum, & vesani dogmatis esse clamitans. *Naucl.* Vol. 2. Generat. 36. apud *Magd.* Cent. 11. p. 389. Quod Sacerdotibus connubiis interdixit *Hildeb.* Pontifex, plerisq; Episcopis novum dogma, omnium maxime pestifera hæresis, quæ unquam Christianum perturbasset Regnum, visa est. Quamobrem Italiæ, Germaniæ, Galliæ Pontifices. ——*Hildeb.* contra pietatem Christianam, verbis, factis agere, facere decernunt; eundem ambitus, hæreseos, impietatis, Sacrilegii condemnant. *Avent.* lib. 5. Annal. *Illyric.* Catal. & *Magd.* cent. 11. pag. 389.

Married

Married Prieſts: But yet the Biſhops in *Germany* did refuſe to yield to this Decree, or to depoſe thoſe Prieſts that were Married, defending themſelves by the *Authority of the Scripture, ancient Councils*, and the *Primitive Church*; adding thereunto, That the *Commandment of God, and humane neceſſity* did directly oppugn the Popes Decree. They long continued to defend their Liberty, inſomuch that ſeeing neither Reaſon, nor Prayer, nor Diſputation would ſerve the turn, the Clergy conſulting together what to do, ſome adviſed, not to return again to the Synod, others to return and thruſt out the Archbiſhop from his Seat, and give him due puniſhment of Death for his deſervings, that by the example of him others might be warned hereafter never to attempt that thing any more to the prejudice of the Church, and the rightful Liberty of Miniſters. The Archbiſhop ſpake them fair, and bid them be of good hope, he would ſend again to *Hildebrand* (the Pope) and they ſhould have what would content their minds; willing them in the mean time to continue as they had done in their Cure and Miniſtry. The next year the Pope ſent Biſhop *Curienſis* as Legate to the Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, and aſſembled again a Council, where the Clergy were commanded under pain of the Popes Curſe to renounce their Wives, or their Livings. The Clergy ſtill defended their Cauſe with great conſtancy, in the end it brake forth into a Tumult, that the Legate and Archbiſhop hardly eſcaped with their lives. After this the Churches would chuſe their Miniſters themſelves, and not ſend them to the Biſhops (the enemies of Miniſters Marriage) to be confirmed and inducted, but put them to their Office without knowledg or leave of the Biſhop.

The Pope did write alſo about this matter to *Otho* Biſhop of *Conſtance*, but this Biſhop would neither ſeparate thoſe that were Married from their Wives, nor yet forbid them to Marry that were Unmarried.

(*i*) So the Clergy of *France*. *Fox.* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. pag. 227.

(*i*) The Clergy of *France* did ſtoutly oppoſe the Popes Bull for the Excommunicating of Married Prieſts that would not Divorce their Wives, declaring their Reaſons from the *Word of God, from Councils*; from the *neceſſity of Nature*, and *reſolved to loſe their Benefices, rather than put away their wives*; ſaying moreover, *If Married Prieſts would not pleaſe the Pope, he muſt call to Angels from Heaven to ſerve the Churches.* But if theſe Clergy-men would not be at the Popes beck, neither would the Angels in Heaven, I know not what other Angels may be.

In the Popes proceeding againſt *Henry* the Emperour, he was oppoſed by the Council at *Wormes*, in which were the Biſhops not only of *Saxony*, but of all the whole Empire of the *Germans*, who did agree and conclude upon the depoſing of *Hildebrand*, and *Roulandus* (*k*) was ſent to *Rome*, who in the name of the Council commanded the Pope to yield up his Seat.

(*k*) *Roulandus* ſacerdos, literas Imperatoris deferens, abſq; omni ſalutationis honore, tibi (*Hildeb.* compellans, inquit) Imperator,— & Italiæ, Galliæ, Germaniæq; Epiſcopi, præcipiunt, ut te, munere quod aſtu, pecunia, gratia occupaſti, abdices. Non enim verus paſtor, neq; pater, neq; Pontifex es, ſed fur, lupus, latro & tyrannus. [Brave couragious *Roulandus*.] *Avantin.* lib. 5. An. Magd. Cent. 11. p. 425.

This

This same Pope was again judged and condemned by another Council held at *Brixia*, where were divers Bishops of *Italy*, *Lombardy* and *Germany*, in which Condemnation is recited amongst other things, his *Usurping Authority over the Emperour, and taking away and forbidding the Marriage of Priests.*

Towards the end of the thousandth year (when there was again two Popes at once, *Urbane* and *Clement* the third) *William Rufus* King (*l*) of *England* would suffer no appeal from *England* to the Pope of *Rome*, as it was not lawful to do from the time of *William* the Conquerour. And when *Anselm* Archbishop of *Canterbury* Appealed to *Rome*, the King charged him with Treason for so doing: All the Bishops of the Realm stood on the Kings side against *Anselm*; though *Anselm* pleaded hard, saying, *Should I forswear Saint* Peter, *I should deny Christ.* But all the rest of the Bishops disowned any Appeal from *England* to *Rome.*

(*l*) *Fox.* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 242.

(*m*) About the year 1105, two famous Bishops of *Mentz* recorded to be very virtuous and well-disposed, were cruelly and tyrannously dealt with by the Pope, (their Names were *Henry* and *Christian*) *Henry* would make no Appeal to the Pope, but said, *I appeal to the Lord Jesus Christ, as to the most high and just Judg, and cite you* (the two Cardinals that had done him wrong) *before his Judgment, there to answer me before the high Judg.* Whereunto they scoffingly said, *Go you before first, and we will follow after.* Not long after the same *Henry* died, whereof the two persecuting Cardinals having intelligence, said one to another jestingly, *Behold, he is gone before, and we must follow after according to our promise.* A little after they both died in one day; the one voided out all his Entrails into the draught; the other gnawing off the fingers off his hands, & spitting them out of his mouth (all deformed in devouring himself) died.

(*m*) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 254.

How the Clergy were against the Popes Decrees that they should put away their Wives, or lose their Livings, we might learn from a large Copy of Verses made by an English Author, concerning Pope *Calixtus*, for this.

O bone Calixte, nunc omnis clerus odit te,
Quondam Presbyteri poterant uxoribus uti,
Hoc destruxisti, postquam tu Papa fuisti, &c.

(*n*) Acts & Mon. 256.

(*o*) About this time the Bishop of *Florence* did teach and preach that Antichrist was now manifest, for which Pope *Paschalis* did burn his Books.

(*o*) Ibid. 254.

At this time also Historians mention two more famous Preachers, *Gerhardus* and *Dulcinus Navarensis*, (*p*) who did earnestly labour and preach against the Church of *Rome*, defending and maintaining that *Prayer was not more holy in one place than in another, That the Pope was Antichrist; That the Clergy and Prelates of* Rome *were Rejects, and she the very Whore of* Babylon *spoken of in the Revelations.* These two brought thirty more with them into *England*, who by the King and Prelates were all burnt in the forehead, and so driven out of the Realm, and after that were slain by the Pope.

(*p*) Illyric. Catalog.

At

(q) *Fox*, Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 299.

At this time also in the City of *Tholouſe* (q) there were a great multitude of Men and Women whom the Popes Commiſſioners did perſecute and condemn for Hereticks; of whom ſome were ſcourged naked, ſome chaſed away. One of the Articles they maintained was that the Bread in the Sacrament after Conſecration was not the very Body of the Lord.

Illyric. Cat.

In *Germany* alſo *Robert Abbot* of *Duits* preached againſt the Popes Juriſdiction as to Temporal Domnion, interpreted that place, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, to be underſtood concerning Chriſt, &c.

(r) Petr. Cluniacenſ. lib. 1. Epiſt. 1. & 2.

(r) Beſides theſe there was *Peter Bruis*, Ann. 1126, and after him his Diſciple *Henry*, Ann. 1147, in *France* drew many Provinces from the Church of *Rome*, preached againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, *the Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Suffrages and Oblations for the Dead*, *Purgatory*, *worſhipping of Images*, *Invocation of Saints*, *ſingle life of Prieſts*, *Pilgrimages*, *ſuperfluous holy-days*, *Conſecration of Water*, *Oyl*, *Frankincenſe*, &c. The Pope and his Prelates they called *Princes of Sodom*, *the Church of* Rome *they termed* Babylon, *the mother of fornication and confuſion*. This *Peter Bruis* preached the Word of God among the People of *Tholouſe* for the ſpace of twenty years with great commendation and at laſt was burned.

I muſt but name *Honorius* Biſhop of *Auguſta*, who ſet out the Iniquity and Wickedneſs of the Church of *Rome* to the life; recited largely by *Du-pleſſ. Miſt. of Iniq.* p. 294.

And *Nordbertus*, Ann. 1125, that proteſted to *Bernard*, That Antichriſt he knew certainly would be revealed in this preſent Generation.

(s) *Joh. Sariſbur.* in *Policr.* lib. 6. cap. 24. *Du-pleſſ.* 319.

And *John* of *Sariſbury* (s) who viſiting the Pope, was asked by him, What men thought of the Pope, and of the *Roman* Church, who told him to his face, They ſay the Pope is a burden to all, and almoſt intolerable. And much more.

Did the Papiſts never hear of the *Waldenſes*, or have they not been vexed with their Doctrine before *Luther* was born, that they ask where was our Doctrine and Religion before *Luther*?

Did the Council of *Conſtance* condemn the Doctrines of *Wickliffe* and *Huſs* as Erroneous, and was there ſuch a noiſe about them, and yet did not the Church of *Rome* hear of our Doctrines (then owned by them) before *Luther*? they can never make us believe it.

(t) Inter omnes has ſectas quæ adhuc ſunt, vel fuerunt, non eſt pernitioſior Eccleſiæ quam Leoniſtarum; & hoc tribus de cauſis; prima eſt, quia eſt diuturnior, aliqui enim dicunt, quod duravit à tempore Sylveſtri; aliqui a tempore Apoſtolorum. Secunda, quia eſt generalior, fere enim nulla eſt terra, in qua hæc ſecta non ſit. Tertia, quia cum aliæ omnes Sectæ immanitate Blaſphemiarum in Deum, audientibus horrorem inducunt, hæc magnam habet ſpeciem pietatis, eò quod coram hominibus juſtè vivant, & bene omnia de Deo credant, & omnes articulos qui in Symbolo continentur, ſolum modo Romanam Eccleſiam blaſphemant & clerum, cui multitudo Laicorum facilis eſt ad credendum. *Rainer. cont. hær. cap. 4.*

Let *Rainerius* a Frier writing of the *Waldenſes*, or *Pauperes de Lugduno* ſatisfie them, who ſaith, "Among all the Sects that are or ever

"will

"will be, none can be more pernicious to the Church of God (he "means the Church of *Rome*) than that of *Lions*. And he giveth these three Reasons, (1) "Because it hath continued a longer time than any, "some say that it hath been ever since the time of *Sylvester*, others say "from the times of the Apostles. (2) Because it is more general, for "there is not almost any Country whereinto this Sect hath not crept. "(3) Because all others procure horrour by their Blasphemies against "God; this of the *Lyonists* hath a great appearance of Piety, in as much "as they live uprightly before men, and put their trust in God in all "things, and observe all the articles of the Creed, only they blaspheme "the Church of *Rome*, and hold it in contempt, and therein they are "easily believed by the People. A fair Confession of a Papist. So that you see, they can tell if they list, where and when, and by whom our Doctrines were taught before *Luther*, but they use this Question to beguile the ignorant People, *Where was your Religion before* Luther?

And *Jacobus* of *Riberia* acknowledgeth that the *Waldenses* had continued a long time. The first place (saith he) they lived in was in *Narbonne* in *France*, and in the Dioceses of *Albie*, *Rhodes*, *Cabors*, &c. and at that time there was little or no estimation of such as were called Priests, Bishops and Ministers of the Church; for being very simple and ignorant almost of all things, it was very eatie for them through the excellency of their Learning and Doctrine to get unto themselves the greatest credit among the People; and for as much as the *Waldenses* disputed more subtilly than all others, were often admitted by the Priests to teach openly, not for that they approved their opinions, but because they were not comparable to them in wit. In so great honour was the Sect of these men that they were both exempted from all Charges and Impositions, and obtained more benefits by the Wills and Testaments of the Dead than the Priests.

Rainerius saith of them, that they had Translated the Old and New Testament into the Vulgar Tongue, they teach and learn it so well, that I have seen and heard (saith he) a Country Clown recite *Job* word by word, and divers others that could perfectly deliver all the New Testament.

The Doctrines that these *Waldenses* taught before *Luther*, are the same that the Reformed Churches do now hold; (1) As that only the holy Scripture is to be believed in matters of Salvation. (2) That all things are contained in holy Scripture, necessary to Salvation, and nothing to be admitted in Religion, but what only is commanded in the Word of God. (3) That there is one only Mediator, other Saints in no wise to be made Mediators, or to be Invocated. (4) That there is no Purgatory. (5) That Masses sung for the Dead are wicked. (6) All mens Traditions to be rejected, at least not to be reputed as necessary to Salvation. (7) That differences of Meats. (8) Variety of Degrees and Orders of Priests, Friers, Monks and Nuns. (9) And

Æneas Sylvius, Bohemica Historia de Waldensium dogmatibus. Fox Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. pag. 299, 300.

superfluous holy days. (10) And Peregrinations with all the rablement of Rites and Ceremonies brought in by man are to be abolished. (11) That the Supremacy of the Pope usurping above all Churches, and Kings & Emperors is to be denied. (12) That the Communion in both kinds is necessary to all People. (13) That the Church of *Rome* is very *Babylon*, and the Pope Antichrist, and the fountain of all other. (14) That the Popes Pardons and Indulgences are to be rejected. (15) That the Marriage of Ministers is lawful, and such-like. Their Doctrines are related by *Æneas Sylvius* afterwards Pope, none of their best friends. But the *English* Reader might find them in the Book of Martyrs. *Luther* lived and began the Reformation after the year 1500, these preached this Doctrine before the year 1200; look and see our Doctrine was before *Luther*.

In the year 1200, *&c.* it would be endless to give an account of particular Doctors, that did oppose the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and did maintain the Doctrines we receive.

I might mention *Almaricus* a Doctor of *Paris* that suffered Martyrdom for withstanding Altars, Images, Invocation of Saints, and Transubstantiation.

(*u*) Avent. lib. 7. p. 546.

Also *Everard* (*u*) an Archbishop in *Germany*, in an Assembly of Bishops at *Regenspurge* gave his judgment of the Bishop of *Rome*. "*Hilde-*"*brand* (said he) under colour of Religion laid the foundation of the "Kingdom of Antichrist.-----These Priests of *Babylon* will reign alone, "they can bear no equal, they will never rest, till they have trampled "all things under their feet, and sit in the Temple of God, and be ex-"alted above all that is Worshipped: He which is the Servant of Servants "coveteth to be Lord of Lords, as if he were God; his Brethrens coun-"sels, yea, and the counsel of his Master he despiseth. He speaks great "things as if he were God; in his breast he casteth new devices, where-"by to raise a Kingdom to himself; he changeth Laws and confirms "his own; he defileth, plucketh down, spoileth, deceiveth, murdereth. "Thus that child of Perdition (whom they use to call Antichrist) in "whose forehead is written, the name of Blasphemy, I AM GOD; I "cannot Err; sitteth in the Temple of God and beareth rule far and "near. Was this *Luther*, that speaks so like him against the Pope? no, one born long before him, or else the Papists would go too nigh to "say, This Doctor had learned this from *Luther*.

The Preachers in *Sweden* publickly taught that the Pope and his Bishops were Hereticks. It would be too long to give account, how the Pope was opposed by *Frederick* the Second, and by *John* King of *England* a great while, though at last he delivered the Kingdom of *England* and *Ireland* to the Pope, and Farmed them of him for a Thousand Marks *per annum*; and afterward was poysoned by a Monk; and though he made this Resignation of these Kingdoms for himself, and his Heirs for ever to the Pope, yet his Son and Successor *Henry* the

the Third made great Oppoſition againſt; as did the Lords and Nobles in his Fathers days, and have left a Lamentation upon record of that fact of King *John.* (w)

(w) *Fox* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. *Guilelmus Pariſienſis* circa Ann. Domini 1220, acerrime inſectatur Sacerdotes ſui temporis, dicens, in eis nihil pietatis ac eruditionis comparere, ſed potius diabolicas turpitudines, omnium ſpurcitiarum ac vitiorum monſtruoſitatem, eorum peccata non ſimpliciter peccata eſſe, ſed peccatorum monſtra terribiliſſima, eos non Eccleſiam, ſed Babylonem, Ægyptum ac Sodomam eſſe; Prælatos non ædificare Eccleſiam, ſed deſtruere, ac Deo illudere; eos cum aliis Sacerdotibus prophanare ac polluere corpus Chriſti, &c. *Lib. de collatione Beneficiorum.*

But the Hiſtory of the *Waldenſes* now ſpread far and near ſtands like a Beacon on an Hill that all that do not ſhut their eyes have clear light to ſee that our Doctrines were taught in abundance of places before *Luther*, theſe continued in *Dauphine*, *Languedoc*, and *Guienne*, and in all thoſe Mountains which reach from the *Alpes* to the *Pyrenean*. They had ſpread themſelves into *Germany*, where were a great many of their Preachers who at the ſound of a Bell preached in a publick place, "That "the Pope was an Heretick, his Prelates ſeducers, that they had no "Power to bind and looſe, or to interdict the uſe of Sacraments, and "told them that though they had not come, God would have raiſed "up others, even of the very ſtones, for to enlighten the Church by "their Preaching, rather than he would have ſuffered Faith utterly to "have periſhed.

By this time they Ordained Preachers in *Spain*, which preached the ſame Doctrine with them, and in *Lombardy* much multiplied. Yea in one only Valley called *Camonica* they had ten Schools. Another ſaith, that their little Rivers ſtreamed ſo far as to the Kingdom of *Sicily*, and the only reaſon of their ſufferings is ſaid to be becauſe they withdrew the ſheep from the keeping of Saint *Peter*, and departed from the *Roman* Church. Do not you yet ſee where any were that owned and preached our Doctrines before *Luther?* Go then to *Jack Upland* (x) written by *Geofry Chaucer*, and anſwer his Queſtions, and ask this queſtion no more for ſhame.

(x) *Fox* Acts Mon. Vol. 1.

From the year 1300 the bloody Perſecutions and the great Sufferings of multitudes for the true Doctrine and oppoſition to the Church of *Rome* do prove what is ſought after, except they impriſoned and burnt ſo many, they know not for what. For Satan (according to ſome) being bound at the end of the firſt Ten Perſecutions, and remaining bound a thouſand years, was now let looſe again. Do they ask ſtill, Where was our Doctrine before *Luther?* why, where Perſecution was raiſed by Papiſts before *Luther*; for why were ſo many Impriſoned, Baniſhed and Burnt, if they did not look upon them as Hereticks, and whom they ſo call is notoriouſly known. Was not *Conradus Hager* Impriſoned for preaching againſt the Maſs, *Johannes de Caſtilone*, and *Franciſcus de Arcaturs*, were they not burnt, and *Haybulus* Martyred, and *Johannes*

de Rupescissa Imprisoned for certain Prophesies against the Pope? Did not *Militrius* a *Bohemian* preach that Antichrist was come, and was he not Excommunicated for the same? Was not *Occam* Excommunicated, and his Books prohibited because they displeased the Pope?

Brushius relates that six and thirty Citizens of *Maguntia* were burned for following the Doctrine of the *Waldenses*, (y) affirming the Pope to be the great Antichrist. Also *Masseus* recordeth of one hundred and forty in the Province of *Narbon* were put to the fire for not receiving the Decretals of *Rome*, besides them that suffered at *Paris* to the number of twenty four, and after them four hundred burned for Hereticks. (z) Was not *Matthias Parisiensis* before *Luther* that writ that the Pope was Antichrist? And was there not an old ancient Writing called the *Prayer and Complaint of the Plowman*, containing many things against the Church of *Rome*? and *Nicolas Orem* before the Pope preached against them.

(y) *Fox.* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. pag. 550.

(z) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 521. to p. 532.

Was not *John Wickliffe* before *Luther*? and did not he maintain the Doctrines that the Reformed Church now holdeth? and a great company of valiant defenders of the same truths, twenty-five articles of *Wickliffe* you may read in the Book of Martyrs. (a) And may we not learn something by the (b) Laws then made in *England* that many here did oppose the Church of *Rome*; as *Ann.* 5. *Rich.* 2. In the year 1380, we read of a great number called evil persons going about from Town to Town preaching to the People divers Sermons containing Heresie and notorious Errors (so Papists call our Doctrines) to the emblemishing of the holy Church.

(a) Acts & Mon. 1. p. 568, 569. Yea 45. Articles of *Wickliff* condemned in the Council of *Constance*. *Surius* in Concil. Tom. 3. p. 790.

(b) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. beginning in the protestation to the Church of *England*. Had the Council of *Constance* so much ado with the Articles of *Huss* and *Jerome*, who were charged with Articles against the Church of *Rome*, and condemned and burnt by the Council, and yet do Papists know none that taught our Doctrine before *Luther*?

And were there not many Witnesses against Popish Doctrines and Asserters of ours from the year 1400? as *John Badby*, *Nicolas Tayler*, *Richard Wagstaff*, *Michael Scrivener*, *William Smith*, &c. *John Huss*, *Jerome* of *Prague*; but why do I mention particular names, when there were a great number of faithful *Bohemians* not to be reckoned, and many other places. The *Bohemians* in this age, near to *Tabour* Castle assembled themselves together to the number of thirty thousand, and having three hundred Tables elected in the fields for that purpose, they received the Sacrament in both kinds. (c)

(c) *Cochleus*, lib. 4. ex *Berkbeck*. Protestant. evid. p. 386.

In the Statute *Ann.* 2. *Hen.* 4. In the year 1402 in *England* there (d) were many Preachers of true Doctrine, which those times called new Doctrines and Heretical, contrary to the Faith and determination of the holy Church, [*Rome* forsooth.] It is recorded in the year 1422, that *Henry Chichesly* Archbishop of *Canterbury* did write to Pope *Martin* the fifth that there were so many in *England* infected with the Heresie of

(d) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. Protestat. to the Church of *England*.

of *Wickliff* and *Huſs* that without force of an Army they could not be ſuppreſſed.

Beſides all theſe that have preached and owned our Doctrine long ago, we might ſend ſuch Papiſts as ask, *Where was your Doctrine before Luther*, to the Churches in other parts of the World, as to the *Greeks*, the *Muſcovites*, the *Melchites* or *Syrians*, the *Armenians*, the *Jacobites*, the *Cophti*, or *Egyptian* Chriſtians, the *Abaſſines* and others, who though too corrupt in many things, yet do agree with the Reformed Churches in many Points wherein they with us differ from the Church of *Rome*, as is witneſſed by *David Chytræus*, who travelled amongſt many of them, and from his perſonal knowledg and converſing with many that were amongſt them; and by Letters from others, gives an account of the ſtate of ſeveral Churches; and by the confeſſion of Faith in the Eaſtern Churches, compoſed by *Crytopulus Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, and others, as alſo by the confeſſion of Papiſts themſelves.

1. Theſe Churches do deny the Popes Supremacy, that he is Head of the Church, and never did ſubmit unto him as Univerſal Head; their words are, *It was never heard in the Catholick Church, that a mortal man, ſubjeſt to a thouſand ſins ſhould be called the Head of the Church; but the Head of the Catholick Church is Jeſus Chriſt.* And much more they in their Confeſſion ſay. (e)

(e) ἐπὶ γὰρ πάντα τὰ παρὰ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἄνθρωπον θνητὸν ἁμαρτίαις ὑποκείμενον κεφαλὴν λέγεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, &c. Confeſ. fidei, Eccl. Orient. per *Crytopulum*, cap. 23. Item *David Chytræus* de ſtatu Eccleſiæ, pag. 21. *Prateol. Elench.* hæret. lib. 7. p. 202. Idem p. 228.

The *Græcians* account Chriſts Vicar the Pope and the *Latins*, excommunicate perſons, *Prateolus*. Of this opinion are the *Moſcovites*, the *Armenians*, *&c.*

2. Theſe Churches agree with us in rejecting the Apocryphal Book from the number of Canonical Scriptures. (f)

(f) Confeſſ. fidei Eccleſ. Orient. per *Critop*, cap. 7.

3. They give the Sacrament in both kinds; they ſay of neceſſity they muſt communicate in both kinds, ſo that if any take it under one kind, although a Lay-man, he is ſaid to ſin, becauſe they ſay he doth againſt Chriſts command. So *Prateolus*. All partake of both kinds, the Bread and the Cup, whether Eccleſiaſtical, or Lay-perſons, Men and Women. (g)

(g) *Prateol.* Elenc. hæret. p. 202. Μαθήκυσι δὲ ὑπὸ πάντας ἐκκλησίας ἑνὸς τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀποστολικῇ πρακτικῇ, τῶν ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου; ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τε καὶ λαϊκοὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες. Confeſ. fid. Eccleſ. Orient. cap. 9.

4. They turn not the Sacrament into a Sacrifice offered for the quick and dead. (b)

(b) Ex Liturgiis Græcorum & narrationibus hominum fide dignorum conſtat, nec miſſas privatas abſq; communicantibus ab eis celebrari ſolere, nec ullâm in eorem canone, ſacrificii corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti pro redemptione vivorum & mortuorum oblati, mentionem fieri, &c. *David Chytr.* de ſtatu Eccleſ. p. 14.

5. They have no private Maſſes, theſe both are teſtified by *Chytræus*. (g)

6. The

(i) Τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ Ὀρθοδοξον παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμολογοῦμεν, καὶ πιστεύομεν, πολὺ ἦν ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν παρεστηκυῖα καὶ περιφέρουσα, ἐκ τῶν ἡ ἐφαρμοδήσα εἰκὼ διδάσκει μεθυσίωσις, &c. Cyril Patriarch. Constant. cap. 17. p. 60.

6. The Doctrine of Transubstantiation is not received amongst them, they confess a true and real Presence in the Lords-Supper, but such a one as Faith offereth, not such as the devised Transubstantiation vainly teacheth. (*i*)

(*k*) Confes. fidei Eccl. Orient per *Critop.* cap. 5. ὡς εἶναι τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀναγκαῖα μυστήρια τρία; βάπτισμα, κοινωνία, μετάνοια.

7. They admit not the seven Popish Sacraments, they own properly but three, Baptism, the Lords-Supper and Penance. (*k*)

(*l*) Confes. fidei Eccles. Orient. c. 11. & *David Chytræus* de stat. Eccl. p. 14.

8. They admit Ministers Marriage. (*l*)

9. They deny Purgatory. It is true the *Greek* Church do believe that there is a place distinct from Heaven and Hell, where some departed Souls are lodged for a while; their opinion is, That those that lived holily, and died in the Lord go immediately to Heaven, and the wicked that die without repentance go presently to Hell; but such as are converted at the end of their life are in another place, in a middle condition, and for these they pray, but yet they do not call this Purgatory. So *Chytræus*. And in their Confession they utterly deny Popish Purgatory, for they affirm the punishment of such departed Souls that are neither in Heaven nor in Hell, *is not material,* (*m*) *neither by fire, nor by any other matter, but only from the affliction and anguish of their own Consciences, remembring then what they did amiss while they were in this world.* However they be far from the truth, yet they be far also from Purgatory fire. For *Alphonsus* saith, That it is one of the most known Errors of the *Græcians* and *Armenians*, that they teach no place of Purgatory, *&c.*

(*m*) Λέγει τοίνυν ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν ἐκείνων ποινὴν μὴ ὑλικὴν εἶναι, εἴτ' ἔν ὀργανικὸν, μὴ διὰ πυρὸς μήτε δι' ἄλλης, οἵοις ἂν ὕλης, ἀλλὰ διὰ θλίψεως καὶ ἀνίας ἃ ἀπ' συνειδήσεως συμβήσεται τίλους ἐκ τῶ μιμνήσκεσθαι τῶν ὅσα ἐν τῷ κόσμω μὴ κατὰ λόγον μηδὲ ὁσίως ἐπράξαν. Confess. eadem cap. 20. Unus ex notissimis erroribus Græcorum & Armenorum est, quo docent nullum esse Purgatorium locum, *&c.* Alphons. adver. hæres. lib. 12. p. 188.

10. Though the *Greeks* dote too much upon Images of Saints, yet they differ much from Papists in this point; for they are against making any Image of God which the Papists do in the likeness of an old man; and to other Images they give (τιμὴν) honour, but neither the Worship of *Latria*, nor *Dulia:* (No, say they) God forbid, for these are only to be given to God. (*n*)

(*n*) Οὐ γὰρ θέμις τὸν ἀπερίγραπτον θεὸν σκιαγραφῆ εἰκόνι παρεικάζειν ---- ἁγίαις δὲ εἰκόσι καὶ τιμὴν τῶν προσήκουσαν ἀπένειμεν: ὑ λατρευτικὴν ἡ ὑλικὴν, ἅπαγε, αὕτα γὰρ θεῷ μόνῳ προσήκουσιν. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. per *Critop.* cap. 15.

11. They carry not the Sacrament in procession about the streets, (as the Papists do to be worshipped by them that meet it) except they send

ſend it to the ſick; for ſay they it was not given to be carried about the ſtreets, but religiouſly to be received for the remiſſion of ſins, according to the Word of God. (o)

(o) Οὐ φερόμενον δὲ τὸ τὸ ἅγιον μυστήριον διὰ τῶν πλατειῶν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον ὅταν κομίζεται εἰς ὄικον νοσοῦντος, ὅτι ὁ δίδοται ἡμῖν τοῦτο ἵνα ἀφεθῶμεν διὰ τῶν πταισμάτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα εὐλαβῶς μεταλάβωμεν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ τὰ διαπύρικὰ ῥήματα. Confeſſ. fid. Eccl. Orient. per eundem cap. 9.

12. They hold the perfection and ſufficiency of the Scripture, that it is Sacriledg to add any thing to it, or take away from it, and contradict thoſe that do. (p)

(p) Ἥτις ἁγία χαρὰν ἐνεπιστεύθη ἐκκλησία ὑπὸ θεοῦ, — ὥστε μήτε προσλιθοῦσα, ἢ ἀφαιρεθεῖσα ἐκεῖθεν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἀσέβειαν ἰσχυσία) ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸς τοιοῦτόν τι τολμῶντας, ἐλέγχει καὶ καθαιρεῖ. Confeſſ. fid. Eccl. Orient. cap. 7.

13. Concerning the marks of the true Catholick and Apoſtolical Church they greatly differ from the Church of *Rome*; the Confeſſion mentions four, and the laſt they lay moſt ſtreſs upon, wherein they teach the ſame with us, namely that it faithfully and ſincerely keep the Word of God, which God hath given to us by his Prophets and Apoſtles. (q)

(q) Τέταρτον καὶ σαφέσατον ἐκκλησίας γνώρισμα, τὸ πιστῶς καὶ ἀδόλως παραδεδόχθαι τὸ θεῖον ῥῆμα ὃ ὁ θεὸς ἐξέδετο διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων. Confeſſ. fid. Eccl. Orient. cap. 7.

14. They do not define the Catholick Church as the *Romaniſts* do, by making it eſſential to ſubmit to any one man as the Head of the whole, but the whole company of ſuch as are found in the Doctrine of Chriſt, every-where diſperſed, but knit together by the bond of the Spirit is the Catholick Church. *Confeſſ. eadem cap. 7.*

By all this (Reader) laid down in as little room as I could, thou maiſt ſee, the harſh and uncharitable ſpirit of the *Romaniſts*, to unchurch all theſe, who do profeſs that they keep to all the Doctrines of the firſt General Councils, (r) in which eſſential Doctrines were ratified as appears by their Creeds, containing the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, (but the *Moſcovites* condemn and curſe the *Romans* as forſakers of the Primitive Church, and breaking of the ſeven General Synods.) As alſo thou maiſt ſee their impudence in asking where our Church and Doctrines were before *Luther*; where there have been ſo many Churches ever ſince the Apoſtles times that have (though not without many corruptions in many things, yet) held to the eſſential Doctrines of Chriſtian Religion, and have not received theſe Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which is but a little Church in compariſon of all the reſt, amongſt whom our Religion was before *Luther*.

(r) Ἕπτα γὰρ καὶ μόνας οἰκουμενικὰς Συνόδους ἡμεῖς ὑποδεχόμεθα, — καὶ ὅσα αἱ οἰκουμενικαὶ ἐκεῖναι ἐξέθεντο τε καὶ ἐβεβαίωσαν. Confeſſio eadem, cap. 15. Acta ſeptem Synodorum Græcarum, Scripta Baſilii, Chryſoſtomi, Damaſceni, eorumq; traditiones tanquam divina oracula amplectantur, ad eaq; de fide & Religione ipſorum ſciſcitantes remittunt, ex literis *Conſtantin.* ad *Dav. Chytr.* de ſtatu Eccleſ. p. 71.

Having

Having made appear that the Doctrines of the Reformed Churches are the ſame that were taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and that by many after them long before *Luther*; the next thing is to demonſtrate *that Popery is a Novelty*; this follows indeed by juſt and good conſequence from what hath hitherto been ſaid in the former parts of the method firſt propoſed to ſpeak of this Poſition in; for two ſuch Doctrines as are ſo contrary, yea ſo contradictory, cannot both be true, and equally old; for Truth muſt be before Error. But yet that Popery had not its being till many hundred years (as now framed) after Chriſt, I ſhall pick out ſome of the chief and moſt material Points of Popery, (and if theſe fall the other cannot ſtand) and give an account of the time when they firſt came in; the reſt whoſe riſe and original as to the particular time is more uncertain, though clear enough that they were not from the beginning, *nor long*, *long after*, will not need ſuch large inſiſting on; and yet in all I muſt endeavour Brevity, which is a task that lyeth upon me, and pincheth me hard all along in ſuch a copious ſubject as this Poſition is.

Firſt, I *ſhall begin at the head*, (which is indeed the head and heart of Popery) which though by that Age it hath, gray hairs are upon it, yet in compariſon of true Antiquity indeed, it will appear that their head is both raw and green, and if the head be young the whole body cannot be old; and the Witneſſes to give in their Teſtimony of the minority of the Pope as Head of the Church as now claimed, are at hand, even ſix ſeveral Councils, which have ſo polled this head, and clipt his beard, that it looketh very young, and bear his age marvellouſly well; for look upon him in the glaſs of true Hiſtory and no man will believe that he is ſo old as he brags to be.

Firſt, my firſt Catalogue of Witneſſes conſiſts of three hundred and eighteen grave ancient Fathers aſſembled in the firſt General Council (that ever was ſince the Apoſtles times,) at *Nice*, in the year of our Lord 325. In reading over the Canons of this Council, I fix upon two, which are fully and directly againſt the Popes Univerſal Soveraignty and Dominion above all other Churches; the one is againſt Excommunicate perſons Appeal in any Dioceſs unto remote Churches; or being harboured or received by them in theſe words.

Concerning perſons Excommunicated, whether they be of the Clergy or the Laity, (s) *Let this ſentence be obſerved by the Biſhops of every Province, according to the Canon, which ſaith, That thoſe which are cast out by ſome, ſhall not be admitted by others.* This Canon clips the Power of the Pope, and takes away his Juriſdiction over other Churches; and was ſo underſtood of old is plain, becauſe when ſome were Excommu-

(s) Περὶ τῶν ἀκοινωνήτων γενομένων. εἴτε ἐν κλήρῳ, εἴτε ἐν λαϊκῷ τεταγμένοις τετάχθω; ὑπὸ μηδ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπων χρηζέτω ὑπ' ἀνόμων καὶ τὸν κανόνα τῶν διαγορευόντα, τοὺς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθέντας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι. ——— Codex Can. Eccleſ. Univerſ. Can. 5.

nicated

nicated in *Africk*, and did run to, and were entertained by the Bishop of *Rome*, the Council in *Africk* did hold irregular, and did write to the Pope so too, and alledged this Canon of the Council of *Nice*, that he ought not to admit them whom they had Excommunicated; of which more when I come to that Council.

The other Canon in this Council runs, (*s*) *Let the ancient customs obtain* [continue in force] *which are in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have power* [authority, the Government] *of all these; because also the Bishop of Rome hath the same custom. Likewise also in Antioch, and in other Provinces, let the Churches have their Dignities,* [Priviledges, Prerogatives] *preserved,* [secured] *to them.*——From thus much of this Canon we easily learn. First, that the Bishop of *Rome* had not Universal Jurisdiction, over all the Churches, because the Bishop of *Alexandria* was to have the same Power, [ἐξουσίαν] Authority, over those parts, and the Bishop of *Antioch*, in those parts, and others, in other Provinces, as the Bishop of *Rome* had in those parts, which could not be if the Bishop of *Rome* were Universal, and they Provincial underlings, for there is not like Power, Authority, or Equality in an Universal and Provincial Bishop according to their own Doctrine. Secondly, we as easily see, that what Power the Pope had, is not by this Council bottomed upon, and derived from the holy Scriptures, or succession from *Peter*, but grounded only upon custom; not a word is here of any Divine right to that power or place in which he then was, which was far inferior to what he claimeth and usurpeth now. For the first three hundred year then, and Universal Head was a *non-ens*, not risen, nor acknowledged in the Church of God. Very good.

(*s*) Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω τὰ ἐν αἰγύπτῳ καὶ λιβύῃ καὶ πενταπόλει, ὡς τὸν ἐν ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνήθες ἐστιν· ὁμοίως καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.——Codex Can: Eccles. Univers. Can. 6.

Secondly, the next Catalogue of Witnesses against the Universal Soveraignty of the Bishop of *Rome*, hath in it *one hundred and fifty Fathers*, assembled at *Constantinople* (which *Caranza* saith, is one of the four principal Councils, and next after the Council of *Nice*, whose Authority is already alledged,) about the *year three hundred eighty three.* (So *Codex Canonum.*) These in their first Canon did ratifie and confirm what was done in the *Nicene* Council, and would have it to be observed without violation. Moreover (*u*) they did Decree, *That no Bishop of any Diocess should go to any Churches beyond their own bounds, to meddle with them, nor confound or mingle Churches, but according to the Canons, the Bishop of* Alexandria *should govern what belongs to* Egypt; *and the Bishops of the East only the East, reserving the Priviledges,* [Dignities] *by the Canons of the Council of* Nice *to the Church of* Antioch; *and the Bishops of*

Caranz. p. 200.

(*u*) Τὰς ἀνὰ διοίκησιν ἐπισκοπὰς μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν ταῖς ἐφεξῆς ἐκκλησίαις μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν; τοὺς δὲ τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους, τὴν ἀνατολὴν μόνον διοικεῖν, φυλατομένων τῶν ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ νίκαιαν πρεσβείων τῇ ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ τοὺς τῆς ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους τὰ τῆς Ἀσιανῆς μόνον οἰκονομεῖν, &c. Φυλαττομένου δὲ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου καὶ περὶ διοικήσεων κανόνος εὐδήλου ὡς τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἡ τῆς ἐπαρχίας σύνοδος διοικήσει καὶ τὰ νικαία ἐψηφίσατο.——Ibid. Can. 165. sed Concilii lib. Can. 2.

the Asian *Diocess, should govern the* Asian *Diocess only. And the Bishops of the Diocess of* Pontus, *what appertaineth to that Diocess only; and so the Bishops of* Thrace, *should in* Thrace. *And that no Bishop of any Diocess should go, except he be called to Ordination, or any other Church-dispensations. This Canon above written concerning Diocesses, being kept, it is manifest that those things which appertain to each Province, should be ordered by the Synod of that Province* (if they had said, All, by the Bishop of *Rome*, the Universal Head, it would have made their hearts to leap within them, and made his Holiness smile; but alas! they carried it quite another way, by the Synod of the Province.) *according to the determinations of the* Nicene *Council.*----(*w*) And in the next Canon they Decreed, *That the Bishop of* Constantinople, *for as much as it is new* Rome, *should have the badges of honour next to the Bishop of* Rome. From this General Council we learn, first, That they vote against any one being Universal Head; because, secondly, every Bishop was to govern in his own Diocess, and no other was to meddle, except desired, with any Ecclesiastical matters in anothers Province. Thirdly, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* is made equal with the Bishop of *Rome*, save that his Worship (I should have said Lordship, but that they will not think high enough, but I cannot help it, these two Councils forbid me to say Head,) should sit in the first place, or before the other, which yet he might have done, without Universal Jurisdiction. Fourthly, we learn that this honour that they either had was not bottomed upon Divine Right, but because they were Bishops in the Imperial Cities; but here is not a word, *thou art Peter, &c. Peters* Successor, *&c.* Apostolical Seat, *&c.* All this is very good evidence that the Pope is not so old as to reach to the times of this Council neither.

(*w*) Τὴν μὲν τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν ῥώμην. Ibid. Can. 166. aliter Can. 3.

Thirdly, the next Catalogue of Witnesses that yet the Bishop of *Rome* was not Universal Head consists of two hundred Fathers, assembled in a General Council at *Ephesus* in the year 431, (so *Codex. Canon.*) Or as others 434, or thereabouts. This Council is so full, that I wonder how the Papists so many of them as have set forth so many Volums of Councils could with patience write what so much made against them, and yet go on in their error challenging Headship from the Apostles times. The Canon declareth the occasion of its Constitution, in this manner, (*x*) Reginus *our fellow Bishop, and beloved of God, together with*

(*x*) Τὸ ἔγκλημα παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεσμὸς καὶ τοὺς κανόνας τῆς ἁγίων καινοτομούμενον καὶ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀπτόμενον προσηγγέλη, &c. Ὥστε ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Ἀντιοχέων πόλεως, τὰς ἐν κύπρῳ πολιτεῖαι χειροτονίας, &c. Ἔδοξεν τὸ ἀνεπιμίκτως καὶ ἀζήλωτον εἰ τῆς ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τῶν κυρίων τρωτοῦτες καὶ τοὺς κανόνας τῆς θείων πατέρων καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν συνήθειαν, δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας τῆς ὑπαζιστάτων ἐπισκόπων ποιεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλλων διοικήσεων καὶ τῆς ἀπασῶν ἐπαρχιῶν παρεφυλαχθήσεται, ὡς μηδένα τῆς θεοφιλεσάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐπαρχίαν ἑτέραν ἐκ ὖσαν ἀνωθεν καὶ ἐξαρχῆς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὸ, ἤγουν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸ χειρα, καλαλαμβάνειν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τις κατέλαβεν καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτῶ πεποίηται βιασάμενος τινὸν ἀποδίδναι, ἵνα μὴ τῆς πατέρων οἱ κανόνες παραβαίνωνται, μὴ ὑπ' ἐν ἱερωσύνης προσχήματι, ἐξουσίας κοσμικῆς τῦφος παρεισδύνται, &c. Codex. Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 178. aliter Concil. Ephes. Can. 8.

the

the holy Bishops of the Province of Cyprus, Zenon *and* Evagrius, *have declared to us a new thing, contrary to Ecclesiastical Laws, and Canons of the holy Fathers, and that which reacheth* [concerneth] *the liberty of all: wherefore since common diseases need the greater medicine, for as much as they do the more harm, the ancient custom not being followed*; to wit (this new thing was) *that the Bishop of* Antioch *had Ordained some in* Cyprus, *as some eminent for Religion coming to the holy Synod have both by writing and by their own words informed*; (wherefore it is decreed that) *the Presidents of the holy Churches in* Cyprus *shall have this, without detriment and violation of their right, according to the Canons of the holy Fathers, and the ancient custom, themselves to Ordain godly Bishops, and this also shall be observed in other Dioceſſes and Provinces every where, that no Bishop draw under his Subjection any other Province, which was not his from the beginning, or his Predeceſſors*; *and if any Bishop hath made such invasion, and by violation* [or wrong] *made it subject to him, he shall again restore it*; *that the Canons of the Fathers be not transgressed, lest under pretence of Priesthood the arrogance* [or swelling pride] *of worldly power creep in unawares, and we insensibly and by little and little lose that liberty which Jesus Christ our Lord, the Redeemer of Mankind, hath purchased for us with his own Blood, and given freely to us. It seemeth good therefore to this holy and general Synod, that the Rights which they have had from the beginning be secured to every Province, pure and inviolable, according to the ancient custom*; *every Metropolitan having liberty to take a copy of the Acts for his own security. And if any one shall take a Copy contrary in any thing to what is now determined, it pleased all the holy and Universal Synod that it should be void.* Thus far this General Council unanimously voted against one Bishops medling with, encroaching upon the Provinces of others; calling it a new thing, &c. How then was one Bishop owned as Head over all the rest.

Fourthly, another Catalogue of six hundred and thirty (so *Caranza*,) assembled in a General Council at *Chalcedon* in the year 451; therein their first Canon ratifie and confirm all the Canons of the former Councils, so that by the vote of these, they to this year are against the Primacy and Soveraignty of any one Bishop. In another Canon they determined, (y) *That if any Clergy man had any difference with his own, or another Bishop, it should be tried by the Synod of the Province*; *but if there were any controversie betwixt a Bishop, or Clergy-man, and the Metropolitan of the Province, he or they should go to the Diocesan or to the seat of the Royal City of* Constantinople, *and there have it tried.* So then Appeals to *Rome* hereby are cut off; and the same is ratified again in another Canon of

(y) Εἰ δέ τις κληρικὸς πρᾶγμα ἔχοι πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον, ἢ τις πρὸς ἕτερον ὁμόχοσον παρὰ τὴν συνήθη τῶν ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω: εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην, ἐπισκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοῖν, καταλαμβανέτω, ἢ τὸν Ἔξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλίδος νεας Ρώμης θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω. Codex Can. Eccleſ. Univerſ. Can. 187. item Can. 195.

(z) Τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπονεμων τῷ τῆς βασιλικῆς πόλεως ἀγιωτατῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίνοντες ἡ βασιλικὴ καὶ ἡ ἴσων ἀπολαύουσα πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, &c. Codex can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 206.

the ſame Council. Again, they (z) decreed, *That the Church of* Conſtantinople *ſhould have equal priviledges with* Rome, *that as the Fathers before them had given the Priviledg to elder* Rome, *becauſe it had the Empire; ſo being moved by the ſame reaſon they gave the ſame priviledges to* Conſtantinople, *new* Rome, *thinking it reaſon that the City which is honoured with the Empire and Senate ſhould be alike advanced with old* Rome, *in all Eccleſiaſtical matters.* From whence it plainly follows, firſt, that what priviledg or precedency was given to *Rome*, was not by reaſon of *Peters* ſuppoſed Chair, but becauſe it was honoured with Empire; ſo that in the judgment of the Ancients he had no Divine Right. Secondly, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was equal with the Biſhop of *Rome* in all things, as alſo were the Metropolitans of the *Aſian*, *Thracian* Dioceſs, and of *Pontus*, then at this time he was not yet Univerſal Biſhop.

(a) *Euſeb.* Eccleſ. Hiſt. lib. 7. cap. 23, &c. & 36. *Socrat.* lib. 2. cap. 11.

Fifthly. Another Evidence in this cauſe is the Council held at *Antioch* in the year 341, (ſo *Codex Canon.*) the occaſion whereof was this: In the time of *Julius* the firſt, (a) Biſhop of *Rome* in the Eaſtern Church ſeveral Biſhops were Depoſed for divers cauſes by their Synods; which Biſhops went to *Rome*, acquainted *Julius* with their whole Eſtate and Trouble; *Julius* writeth to the Biſhops of the Eaſt, telling them, *They had done very ill to determine and conclude any thing againſt thoſe Biſhops without his privity.* Which when they received, took the correction of *Julius* for a contumely, or ſlander, they ſummon a Council at *Antioch*, there aſſoon as they had aſſembled together, deviſed an Epiſtle by uniform conſent of them all, wherein they bitterly inveigh againſt *Julius*, and ſignifie withal, *That if any were baniſhed the Church and Excommunicated by their Decree, and Cenſure, it were not his part to intermeddle, nor to ſit in judgment upon their ſentence.* And did then Decree, (b) *That if any Biſhop ſhould be accuſed, and the matter could not be determined by the Biſhops of the Province, ſome pronouncing the accuſed to be innocent, others to be guilty, for the taking up of the whole Controverſie, the Metropolitan ſhould call others to judg from the neighbouring Province, and what ſhould be ſo determined ſhould ſtand firm.* And in the next Canon, they did ratifie, *That if any Biſhop was accuſed, and condemned by all the Biſhops of the Province, and all ſhould with one conſent pronounce ſentence againſt him; he ſhould no more be tried by any other. But the ſentence of*

(b) Εἰ τὶς ἐπίσκοπος ἐπί τισιν ἐγκλήμασι κείνοιτο, ἔπειτα συμβαίη μὴ ἀυτῷ διαφωνεῖν τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπους, ἀλλ' ἀμφοτέρων ἡ γνώμη ἀπαλλαγῆς πάσης ἀμφισβητήσεως ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ ἡ τὸ μητροπολίτου ἐπισκοπον, ὑπὲρ τὸ πλησιόχωρα ἐπαρχίας μεταπαλεῖσθαι ἑτέρους τινὰς τοὺς ἐπικρινοῦντας, καὶ τῶν ἀμφισβήτησιν διαλύοντας; τὸ βεβαιῶσαι σὺν τοῖς τῆς ἐπαρχίας τὸ πλειόνων. Codex Can. Eccleſ. Univerſ. Can 93. Εἰ τὶς ἐπίσκοπος ἐπί τισιν ἐγκλήμασι κατηγορηθεὶς, κριθεῖν ὑπὸ πάντων δεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ὄντων, πάντας τὸ σύμφωνοι μίαν καθ' αὐτὸ ἐξενέγκειν ψῆφον, ὥστε μηκέτι παρ' ἑτέρῳ δικάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μένειν βεβαίαν τῶν σύμφωνον δεῖ ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας ὄντων ἀπόφασιν. Codex Can. Eccleſ. Univerſ. Can. 94. apud Caranz. & Surium, Concil. Antiochen. Can. 14, 15.

the

the Bishops of the Province should be to all purposes valid. Clearly do they take away all Appeals to *Rome*, as the matter of the Canons, and the occasion of making of them doth fully demonstrate. And this Council was confirmed in the sixth General *Constantinopolitan* Synod held in *Trul*, and by Pope *Dionysius*, and so hath the Authority of a General Council and Pope too, therefore with the Papists themselves should be authentick. *Caranz. Sum. Concil. p.165. Euseb. lib.7. cap.24, & 25. Surius Concil. Tom.1. pag.399.*

Sixthly. Another full Evidence that the Bishop of *Rome* was not owned as Universal Head is the stout opposition made against it (in their early aspiring after it) by *two hundred and seventeen Fathers* assembled, (*Augustine* being one, and *Aurelius* President) in the year 419, (so *Codex Can. Ecclesiæ Africanæ.*) The Controversie then was this. *Apiarius* a Priest in *Africa*, was for his scandalous life Excommunicated, in an *African* Synod, hereupon he fled to the Bishop of *Rome*, who absolved him, and commanded him to be restored to his place; and *Zozimus* Bishop of *Rome* to justifie this, claimed a right to receive Appeals from all parts of the World, and for proof thereof pretended a certain Canon of the *Nicene* Council that did give it him; the Council not finding any such Canon in the Decrees of the Fathers at *Nice*, sent away Letters and Messengers to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, that they would send to them the Acts of the *Nicene* Council, fast closed and sealed up, because they could not find a Canon which was alledged by the Legats of the Bishop of *Rome*, from these they received several Copies, all agreeing, but in none of them what *Zozimus* had affirmed to be in them, that he was shamefully by all the Council convinced of forgery, that he did greatly err, they all proved; for the Copies taken out of the Originals by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and by *Atticus* of *Constantinople*, *&c.* had no such thing in them; and the whole Council writing to *Boniface*, (in which Letter they call *Zozimus* a man of unhappy memory,) desired him to repel those that made him their refuge, both because there is no such constitution of the Fathers, which hath at any time so much derogated from the Authority of their Churches, as also because the *Nicene* Council hath apparently left the ordering of all Inferiours to the judgment of their Metropolitan, and had determined that all matters of Controversie should receive their final decision in the place where they began; for how can a judgment given beyond the Seas be good, where Witnesses necessarily required in such cases, cannot be present, either in regard of their sex, or age, or some other Impediment.---Because it is granted to every one to appeal to the Councils of their own Provinces, or to an Universal Council.-----Unless there should be any one that can think that our God can inspire a justice of trial into any One man, and deny it to innumerable Priests that are assembled in Council; and much more these Letters of the Council to *Boniface*, of *Cyril* of *Alexandria* to the Council, and of *Atticus*

ticus of *Conſtantinople* to the ſame, and the Copies of the *Nicene* Council ſent to them, and the Epiſtle of the Council to Pope *Celeſtine*, are in the end of *Codex Canon. Eccleſ. African.* and in *Surius Tom.* 1. *p.*588, &c. Thus much for their Letters, now for the Canons of the *African* Church againſt the Headſhip of the Biſhop of *Rome*. In the 19. Canon, *If any Biſhop be accuſed, the accuſer ſhould bring his cauſe before the Primate of the Province.* Can. 23. *That no Biſhop ſhould go beyond the Sea, unleſs he had the conſent of the Biſhop of the firſt ſeat of every Province.* Can. 28. *That Presbyters* (c) *Deacons, and others, if they have complaint againſt their Biſhops, the neighbouring Biſhops ſhould hear them, and if they would appeal from them, it ſhould not be to the judgments of any beyond the Sea, but to the Primates of their own Provinces, or to a General Council, as was decreed before concerning Biſhops, as for thoſe that ſhall appeal beyond the Sea, none ſhall receive them into Communion in Africk.* So alſo Canon 125.

(c) Ὁμοίως ἤρεσεν, ἵνα οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοὶ, ἐν αἷς ἔχωσιν αἰτίας, ἐὰν τὰ δικαστήρια μέμφωνται τῶν ἰδίων ἐπισκόπων, οἱ γείτονες ἐπίσκοποι ἀκροάσωνται αὐτῶν: καὶ συναιρέσεως τὸ ἰδιὰ ἐπισκόπου, τὰ μεταξὺ αὐτῶν διαθῶσιν οἱ προσκαλέμενοι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπίσκοποι. διὸ εἰ καὶ δεῖ αὐτῶν ἔκκλητον παρέχεσθαι νομίσωσιν, μὴ ἐκκαλέσωνται εἰς τὰ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης δικαστήρια, ἀλλα πρὸς τοὺς πρωτοθρόνους τῶν ἰδίων ἐπαρχιῶν, ὡς καὶ δεῖ παρ' ἐπισκόπων πολλάκις ἄκουσαι ἐν τῇ πρὸς πραγματικὰ δικαστήρια διακαλέμενοι, πάρεξ ἐάν τινός ἐν τῇ Ἀφρικῇ διαθέσεις εἰς κοινωνίαν. Codex Can. Eccleſ. African. Can. 28.

So far we ſee that the Church of God did curb and reſtrain the ambition of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and ſtoutly ſtood againſt the invading endeavours of aſpiring Antichriſt. Yet will I add one more, (and ſo let the Councils paſs for this head; that is, againſt the Univerſal Head, and that is of a Council at *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Agatho* Biſhop of *Rome*, which was about the year 673, or as others 681, who did ſmartly ſnub (the pretended Mother, that is to give Laws to all others) by making a Law to reach as far, and to bind the Church of *Rome*, ſaying, (d) *For as much as we underſtand that in the City of* Rome *in time of Lent, they faſt upon the Sabbath-days, contrary to the cuſtom of the Church, it is decreed in this Synod, that alſo in the Church of* Rome, *that Canon ſhall be of force without violation, which ſaith, if any of the Clergy ſhall be found faſting on the Lords-day or Sabbath, except one and that only, let him be depoſed, but if he be of the Laity, let him be Excommunicated.* This the Church of *Rome* in the heighth of their pride would hardly brook, but you ſee as far as this time reacheth, many Councils knew no ſuch thing as an Univerſal Head, but oppoſed the firſt appearance of it.

(d) Quoniam intelleximus in Romanorum civitate, in ſanctis quadrigeſimæ jejuniis in ejus Sabbatis jejunare, præter Eccleſiaſticam conſuetudinem traditam; ſanctæ Synodo viſum eſt, ut in Romanorum quoque Eccleſia inconcuſsè vires habeat Canon qui dicit: Si quis clericus inventus fuerit in ſancto dominico vel Sabbatho jejunans, præter unum & ſolum, deponatur, ſin autem Laicus, ſegregetur. *Surius in Concil. Tom.*2. *p.*1048. *Concil. VI. Conſtant. Can.* 55. *refer. autem ad Canon. Apoſtol.*66.

To

To these Evidences fetched from Councils I shall add further the expressed judgment of two of their own Bishops, Predecessors of him, that first got the title of Universal Head, *Pelagius* and *Gregory* the Great, which two did so exceedingly inveigh against this title, God in his Providence so ordering it, that the following Popes might be condemned out of the mouths of their Predecessors; whose sharpness of speech against this Usurpation, was occasioned by *John* Bishop of *Constantinople*, surnamed the *Faster*, who did assume to himself the title of Universal Bishop about the year 580, about which time *Pelagius* the second being Bishop of *Rome*, did write to all the Bishops assembled at *Constantinople* in a Synod called by *John* the Bishop of that Seat, saying, "That "they ought not to acknowledg *John* as Universal Bishop, unless they "purposed to depart away from the Communion of all other Bishops: Moreover, saying, *(e)* "Let no Patriarch use to profane a Title, for if "the chief Patriarch should be called Universal, the name of a Patri- "arch should be taken away thereby from all others; but God forbid "it should ever enter into the heart of a Christian to assume any thing "unto himself, whereby the honour of his Brethren should be debased. "For this cause I in my Epistles never call any by that name, for fear lest "by giving him more than is his due, I might seem to take away that "which of right belongeth to him. For the Devil our adversary goeth "about like a roaring Lion, exercising his rage upon the humble and "meek-hearted, and seeking to devour now, not the sheep-coats, but "the very principal members of the Church.---------For he *(of whom he writes)* "cometh near unto him of whom it is written, *This is he which* "*is King over all the children of Pride*: Which words I speak with grief "of mind, seeing our brother and fellow-Bishop *John*, in despight *(mark his reasons against this Head,)* "of the Commandment of our Saviour, "the Precepts of the Apostles, and Canons of the Church, by this "haughty name, to make himself his *(Antichrists)* forerunner, and here- "by *John* goeth about *(mark Reader,)* to attribute to himself all those "things which belong properly to the Head himself, that is, Christ; "and by the Usurpation of this Pompous Title, to bring under his "Subjection all the Members of Christ.-----And that they ought to be- "ware lest this temptation of Satan prevail over them, and that they "neither give nor take this Title of Universal Bishop.

(t) Nullus Patriarcharum universalitatis vocabulo unquam utatur, quia si unus Patriarcha Universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur; sed absit hoc, absit à fidelis cujusquam mente, hoc sibi vel vellé quempiam arripere, unde honorem fratrum suorum imminuere ex quantulacunq; parte videatur, &c. *Jus Can. Dist.* 99. c. Nullus Patriarcharum, *Glos.*

This is a large Testimony against, and a full condemnation of both Name and Office of Universal Bishop, and this by a Bishop of *Rome*, before his Successor had usurped the same. And I might infer, either that the following Bishops of *Rome* do greatly err in taking to themselves this Name and Office, or else this Bishop of *Rome* was fallible and did err in a matter of Faith (made now by them necessary to Salvation) let them choose which they will (for one they must) their Principles are wounded by it.

After this *Pelagius* (for the Usurper was not immediately after him) suc-

succeeded *Gregory* called *the Great*, about the year 590, at which time *John* the fourth of *Constantinople* did still persist in claiming and maintaining his Title of Universal Bishop; at which *Gregory* being much grieved and offended, writes to *Constantia* the Empress against it: "Call-
"ing the exaltation of one man a defiling of that time, *(mark his rea-*
sons also,) "saying far be it that your time should be defiled by the ex-
"altation of one man; *termeth it the* crooked name of Universal *(f)* and an
"unsufferable thing, and that by this arrogancy and pride is portended
"that the time of Antichrist is now at hand; and that *John* imitated
"him, *(Lucifer)* who making light of that happiness which he had in
"common with the other Angels, would needs aspire to a singularity a-
"bove all the rest. *And to the Emperour writing, saith*, "That all those
"who have read the Gospel know well that *Peter (mark, Reader,)* is not
"called the Universal Apostle, and yet behold, my fellow-Priest *John*
"seeketh to be called the Universal Bishop. I am now forced to cry out,
"Oh the times! and Oh the manners of men! *Europe* is now exposed
"for a prey to the Barbarian, and yet the Priests who should lie along
"in the dust upon the pavement, weeping and rolling themselves in
"ashes, do seek after names of vanity; and boast themselves of their
"new-found *(this is a Novelty in the judgment of a Bishop of* Rome,*)* and
"prophane Titles. And in opposition to this pride of *John* he was the
first Bishop of *Rome* that took this Title, *the Servant of Servants*, which
Title his Successors in feigned humility still use, though they usurp the
Title of Universal Bishop, in opposition to which he did so stile himself,
and in excessive pride have added to themselves since many pompous
Appellations.----Again, saith the same *Roman* Bishop, "Now the King
"of Pride is at the gates, and which I dread to speak, an Army of Priests
"and Bishops stands ready to receive him; calls it a superstitious and
"haughty name of Universal Bishop.----Never may such foolery befall
"us; call an Universal Bishop *(very true,)* an Universal Enemy. And
again, "I speak it boldly, that whosoever calleth himself, or desireth
"to be called by others, the Universal Bishop, is in his Elation of mind,
"the forerunner of Antichrist, because that in like Pride he preferreth
"himself before others; Like, I say, for as that wicked One would seem
"as God, above all men, so will this Man exalt himself above all Bishops.
He plainly saith, "That none of the Bishops of *Rome* did ever assume
"that word of Singularity, *&c.* And this same *Gregory* writing to *John*

(f) Tristetamen valde est, ut patienter feratur, quatenus despectis omnibus, prædictus frater & coepiscopus meus solus conetur appellari Episcopus. Sed in hac ejus superbia quid aliud nisi propinqua jam Antichristi tempora designatur? quia illum videlicet imitatur, qui spretis in sociali gaudio Angelorum legionibus, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere,---- Unde per omnipotentem dominum rogo, ne pietatis vestræ tempora permittatis unius hominis elatione maculari, neque tam perverso vocabulo ullum quoquo modo præbeatis assensum, &c. *Gregor. Mag. ad Constant. lib. 4. Epist. 34.* Cunctis Evangelium Scientibus liquet,---- quod *Petrus* Universalis Apostolus non vocatur, & vir sanctissimus consacerdos meus *Johannes* vocari Universalis Episcopus conatur; exclamare compellor, ac dicere, O tempora! O mores!---- & tamen Sacerdotes,---- vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt, & Novis ac prophanis vocabulis gloriantur, &c.---- Nullus *Romanorum* Pontificum unquam hoc singularitatis vocabulum assumsit, nec uti consensit, &c. Quis est iste, qui contra statuta Evangelica, contra Canonum decreta, Novum sibi usurpare nomen præsumit? *Idem, ibid. ad Mauritium, Epist. 32.*

of

of *Constantinople*, (*g*) deals roundly and plainly with him, saying, "When "thou wast called to the Office of a Bishop, thou saidst, That thou wert "not worthy to be called a Bishop, and now thou wouldest have none a "Bishop but thy self.------What wilt thou answer unto Christ, who is "the true Head of the Universal Church, in that day of Judgment, see-"ing that by this name of Universal thou seekest to enthral all the Mem-"bers of his Body unto thy self? whom dost thou imitate herein save "only him, who in contempt of those Legions of Angels, which were "his fellows, sought to mount aloft to the top of Singularity, where he "might be subject to none, and all others subject unto him?

(*g*) Qui enim indignum te esse fatebaris, &c. nec stulto ac superbo vocabulo appellari consentias. —— ut cuncta brevi cingulo locutionis astringam: sancti ante legem, sancti sub lege, sancti sub gratia, omnes hi perficientes corpus domini, in membris sunt Ecclesiæ constituti, & nemo se unquam Universalem vocare voluit, &c. *Idem ibid. ad Joban. Constantinop. Epist.* 38.

But did not he raise all this stir, and make all this opposition because *John* had prevented him because he had not this name and title himself, (*b*) since as he is said to *be the best of all the Bishops of* Rome *that came after him, so the worst of all that were before him.* Let alone what his heart and end was, and hear what he saith, writing to *Eulogius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, (*i*) "You have been careful to advertise me, that you for-"bear now to write unto any by those proud names which do spring "meerly from the root of vanity, and yet speaking to me, you say [as "you commanded], Let me I pray you hear no more of this word com-"mand; for I know well enough what I am, and what you are; in de-"gree you are my Brethren, and in manners you are my Fathers: where-"fore I commanded you nothing, only I advised you, what I thought "fittest to be done; and yet I do not find that you have perfectly ob-"served that which I desired to leave deepest graven in your remem-"brance; for I told you, that you should not write in any such manner "either to me, or to any other, and yet in the very Preface of your Epi-"stle, you call me by that name of pride and vanity, Universal Pope; "which I would entreat you to forbear hereafter, seeing that your selves "lose, whatsoever you give unduly to another. For my part I seek to "encrease in Virtues, and not in vanity of Titles; that addeth nothing "to my honour, which I see taken from my Brethren; my honour is "the honour of the Universal Church; and the sound vigor of my Bre-"thren.------For if you call me Universal Pope, you deny your selves to "be that which indeed you are, in that you call me Universal. But "God forbid, let us rather put far from us these words, which do puff "up to pride and vanity, and woundeth Charity to the death.

(*b*) Nunquid ego, hac in re piissime domine propriam causam defendo? nunquid specialem injuriam vindico? & non magis causam omnipotentis Dei & causam Universalis Ecclesiæ? *Idem ad Maurit. Epist.* 32.

(*i*) Indicare vestra beatitudo studuit, &c. Nam dixi nec mihi vos, nec cuiquam alteri tale aliquid scribere debere, & ecce in Præfatione Epistolæ, quam ad meipsum qui prohibui, direxistis, superbæ appellationis verbum, Universalem me Papam dicentes, imprimere curastis. Quod peto dulcissima mihi sanctitas vestra ultra non faciat, &c. *Idem Epist. lib.* 7. *Epist.* 30. *Lege* etiam ejusdem de eodem Epistolarum, *Lib.* 4. *Epist.* 36. & *Lib.* 6. *Epist.* 5. & 24. & 28. & 30. & 31.

This is that *Gregory*, Bishop of *Rome* that was so vehement in his writing against the name and office of Universal Bishop, that after his death the *Romanists* would have burnt his Works had not one *Peter* a Deacon restrained them by affirming to them, That he often saw the Holy Ghost in the form of a Dove sitting upon the head of *Gregory* while he was writing of them. This is that *Gregory* that so earnestly cried down an Universal Bishop, that Pope *Gregory* the 13*th.* could not answer but by giving this *Gregory* the flat lie. *Plessæus.*

But what follows from that learned Authoritative confutation? but that the Bishop of *Rome* is fallible and may err; for if *Gregory* the Great did speak truth, then *Gregory* the thirteenth did speak false, in saying his Doctrine was a lie. If *Gregory* the thirteenth did speak true, in saying the other did lie and that in a matter of Faith made necessary to Salvation, then did *Gregory* the Great greatly err, in a matter that concerned the Universal Church. Let them take which they will, their Infallibility lyeth in the dust; for it will much puzzle his Holiness to reconcile the parts of a contradiction. Let him try his skill that both *Gregories* might in this be found true.

I have borrowed some Paper to be a little the larger in this, both from Councils, and in transcribing the words of these two, 1. *Because this is the Main* HEAD *and Hinge of our Controversies.* 2. *Because these two were their own, and yet against them.* 3. *Because it makes it plain that to six hundred years the Bishop of* Rome *was not Universal Head, for at that time it was disclaimed by themselves, as you see.* 4. Because the *English Reader* that understandeth not *Latin* Authors, might be satisfied from their own mouths that Universal Soveraignty of the Bishop of *Rome* is not so old as to come up so high as six hundred years after Christ.

But when was this Title first assumed? and by whom was it first conferred upon the Bishop of *Rome*, to be called Universal? that you might know when and how he got up into the Chair.

You have been told before that *Gregory* the Great did write Letters to *Maurice* the Emperour in the Controversie betwixt him and *John* of *Constantinople* about the name Universal. This Emperour *Maurice* falling into dislike among the Soldiers, one *Phocas* a Centurion made himself Captain of those that did mutiny, and was afterwards by them proclaimed Emperour; *Maurice* seeing this fled away with his Wife and Children. *Phocas* was Crowned, and pursueth after his own Master *Maurice*, overtakes him, slew his Wife and Children, or some of them before his eyes, and afterwards caused him to be murdered also. Mark that this *Phocas* was a vile Traitor, and a Murderer of such an excellent Emperour and virtuous Man, as Historians say, that *Maurice* was. A while after that *Phocas* was Emperour, *Gregory* that was Bishop of *Rome* and opposed the Title of Universal Head, departed out of this life, and *Sabinian* a malicious detractor of *Gregory* and his Works succeeded

ceeded him, and continued Biſhop of *Rome* ſcarce two years, after whom ſucceeded *Boniface* the third, about the year ſix hundred and five, who lived not (as ſome ſay) above eight moneths, or as others but a year, after he was Biſhop of *Rome*; but in that time he obtained what he aimed at; for the Murther committed by *Phocas* upon the Emperour *Maurice*, being not approved of by the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, he ſeeking to eſtabliſh himſelf in the Empire (gotten by blood) by the Friendſhip of the Biſhop of *Rome*, *Boniface* making great offers of his ſervice to *Phocas*, took this opportunity to deſire of him that he and his Succeſſors after him, ſhould be called Univerſal Head of all the Churches of Chriſt, and that the Church of *Rome* thence forward ſhould have the preheminence, and be Head of all other Churches; this murdering *Phocas*, and this aſpiring *Boniface* agreeing to help one another, the Biſhop to ſtrengthen him in his Empire got by Rebellion; the Emperour *Phocas* quickly grants that he ſhould be the Univerſal and head-Biſhop over all Chriſtian Churches. And this is acknowledged by their own Hiſtorians. (k)

(k) Quo tempore interceſſerunt quædam odiorum fomenta inter eundem *Phocam* Imp. atq; Cyriacum *Conſtantinopolitanum*. —— Hinc igitur in Cyriacum *Phocas* exacerbatus in ejus odium Imperiali edicto ſancivit, nomen Univerſalis decere Romanam tantum modo Eccleſiam, tanquam quæ caput, eſſe omnium Eccleſiarum, ſolique convenire Romano Pontifici; non autem Epiſcopo *Conſtantinopolitano*, qui ſibi illud Uſurpare præſumeret. Quod quidem hunc *Bonifacium* Papam tertium ab Imperatore *Phoca* obtinuiſſe, cum *Anaſtaſius* Bibliothecarius, tum *Paulus* diaconus tradunt. *Spondan. Epitom. Baron. Annal.* in Annum 606.

From all which you clearly ſee, firſt, that it was not till after the *ſixth hundred* year from Chriſt that the Biſhop of *Rome* had this Title conferred upon him. Secondly, that he came not *to it by divine right, not made ſo by God, nor called and choſen to it by a General Council of Fathers, but by a Traytor and a Murderer.* The Pope giving his help to keep the Uſurper in the Saddle, by way of requital this wicked and Tyrannical Emperour lifts the Pope up into the Chair. A couple well (Oh no miſchievouſly) met to do Offices for each other, but both eminently injurious to others by their Uſurpations, the one in the State, the other in the Church.

As his Name and Office of Univerſal Biſhop is new, ſo are thoſe other accumulative, pompous, and ſome of them blaſphemous Titles not fit to be given to any mortal man. For of old it was not ſo, for *Peter* whoſe Succeſſor he pretends to be had no ſuch Names nor Titles, but ſtiled himſelf a fellow Presbyter, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. (l) And the Canons of the *African* Church of old were that the *Biſhop of the firſt Seat* (that was *Rome*) *ſhould not be called Prince of Prieſts, or head-Prieſt, or any ſuch like name, but only the Biſhop of the firſt Seat.* *Caranza* (m) in his Annotation upon this Canon, ſaith, That the *African* Church could not give

(l) Ὥστε ὁ τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας ἐπίσκοπος μὴ λέγεσθαι ἄρχιερεὺς ἢ ἱερεὺς ἢ ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον πρᾶγμα, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐπίσκοπος τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας. Codex Canon. Eccleſ. Afric. Can. 39. (m) Caranz. Sum. Concil. Carthag. 3. Can. 26.

Laws to the Universal Church, and therefore by this Canon neither did nor could forbid the calling of the Bishop of *Rome*, Prince of Priests, &c. But they could Decree, That they would never call him so, nor own him for such, which shews that by them he was not so advanced. But their own Canon Law (*n*) forbids that the Bishop *of Rome should be called Universal*. And the sixth Council at *Constantinople* (*o*) ratifying the Decree of the 150 Fathers formerly assembled in that City, and of the 630 Fathers assembled at *Chalcedon*, did also agree with them and decree, That the Bishop of *Constantinople* should have equal priviledg with the Bishop of *Rome*, and have equal power in all Ecclesiastical matters with him, only that he be the second to the Bishop of *Rome*, and after the Bishop of *Constantinople*, the Bishop of *Alexandria* should have the next Seat, and next to him, the Bishop of *Antioch*, and next to him the Bishop of *Jerusalem*. By all which appears that the Bishop of *Rome* was not Head of all the rest, the Prince of Priests, but that all the respect that he had above the rest, was to sit down in the first Seat, which is nothing at all to his Universal Jurisdiction, and then he had not those Titles that now are given to him. 1. As Head over all Priests, as a King is over his Judges. 2. The vicar of Saint *Peter*; though now they say not the Vicar of *Peter* properly, but Vicar of Christ properly and Successor of *Peter*. 3. Most mighty Priest. 4. That he hath all Laws in the chest of his breast. 5. Chief Magistrate of the whole World. 6. That his Sacerdotal dignity as far excelleth Kings and Emperours, as Gold excelleth lead. 7. That all the Earth is his Dioceses and he the Ordinary of all men, having the Authority of the King of all Kings upon Subjects. That he is all in all, and above all. 8. If those things that I do, be said to be done not of man but of God, what can you make of me but a God? and the Prelates of the Church being accounted of *Constantine* for Gods, I being above all Prelates by this reason am above all Gods.

(*n*) Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex Universalis est appellandus. *Distinct.* 99. *c.* nec etiam.

(*o*) *Swius* in Concil. Tom. 2. pag. 1046. Concil. *Constantinop.* Can. 36.

Jus Canonic. 1. Dist. 96. c. ego. c. *Constantinus.* 2. Distinct. 63. 3. Juris Canon. pars 2. caus. 25. quest. 1. c. null. 4. Romanus Pontifex, qui jura omnia in Scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere, ——Sexti. Decret. P. *Bonifac.* 8. c. licet. 5. Decret. lib. 6. *Bonifac.* 8. in Proœmio. 6. Distinct. 96. c. duo. 7. Glos. in c. 11. quest. 3. si mimicus. 8. Decret. de Translat. Episc. cap. quanto.

Likewise the Power of the Pope over General Councils is a new Power, it was not so of old, he had not the Power of calling Councils, but did belong to, and was done by Civil Magistrates. The first General Council of *Nice* was assembled by the Authority of *Constantine* the Great; the Second at *Constantinople* was called by *Theodosius* the elder; the Third at *Ephesus* by *Theodosius* the younger; the Fourth at *Chalcedon* by *Valentinian* and *Martian*, &c. Historians tell us that when once the Emperours began to be Christians, from that time forward the Church affairs depended upon them, and the greatest Councils were assembled, and so still are, at their appointment. (*p*) So *Socrates*. And the Council of *Constance*, (which *Caranza* (*q*) saith was General, and in the time of Pope *John* 24, which was after the year 1400, mark how lately, and

(*p*) Eccles. Hist. lib. 5. proœm.

(*q*) *Caranz.* Sum. Concil. p. 824, 825.

and did depose three Popes, *Gregory* 12th, *Alexander* 5th, *John* 24th.) and again in the Council of *Basil*, which began in the year 1431, (mark still how lately), in both these it was decreed, (r) *That a Synod hath its power immediately from Christ, which every one of what state soever or dignity he be; yea, even the Pope himself ought to be obedient, which if they be not, but shall contumaciously contemn the Decrees, Statutes, and Ordinances of the Council, except he repent shall suffer condign punishment, though it be the Pope himself.* And this Council of *Constance* was confirmed by Pope *Martin* the fifth, *Sess.* 45. and the other at *Basil* by Pope *Nicolas* the fifth.

(r) Primo declarat Synodus, — quod ipsa potestatem à Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi Papalis existat, obedire tenetur, &c. *Conc. Constan. Sess.* 4, 5. & *Conc. Basil. Sess.* 2. & 16. & 18.

By all this it doth appear that the main essential point of Popery is a meer Novelty, having not its original till after the sixth hundred year after Christ, and not got up to its full power till several hundred years after this. So that I may (as *Voetius* doth) confidently affirm, that in the first six hundred years, there was NO CHURCH, NO ONE DOCTOR, NO ONE MARTYR, NO CONFESSOR, NO ONE FAMILY, NO NOR ONE MEMBER OF THE CHURCH, NEITHER IN THE WEST, NOR IN ANY OTHER PART OF THE WORLD, THAT WAS PROPERLY AND FORMALLY A PAPIST. What is then become of the ANTIQUITY of POPERY? and this I bottom upon this foundation, because there cannot be so much as one [Formal] Papist, where the Essentials of Popery are not; as where the Essentials of a man are not, there is no man actually existent, but the Pope as Universal Head is the Essential part of the Popish Religion, without which (according to their Doctrine) the Church is no Church, nor any one a Member thereof that doth not own him and submit unto him. Therefore the Pope not being till after the sixth hundredth year, so long there was not one Papist (formally and properly) in the whole World.

(s) *Syricius* primus Sacerdotibus & Diaconis circiter annum salutis 388. conjugio interdixit, — non ante Pontificatum *Gregorii* 7, Ann. 1074, connubium adimi Sacerdotibus occidentalibus potuit. *Polyd. Virg. de Invent. rer. lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. (t) *Magdeb. cent.* 11. *pag.* 389.

This being the main Pillar of Popery I have insisted the longer to prove Novelty of it; for this falling, the whole Fabrick tumbleth down: as therefore it is not necessary that I should be so large in the rest, so for want of more room and paper I must be constrained to contract and but name what follows.

Secondly. *The forbidding of Ministers Marriage is a meer Novelty.* For as their own (s) Authors say, *Syricius* Bishop of *Rome* that lived about the year 388, was the first that did forbid it; yet it was not then received and practiced as a duty for them to abstain from Marriage, but liberty of Marrying was never denied them till *Gregory* the 7. came to be Pope in the 1074, who yet was resisted, as one that brought in a new custom, never received before, and the Bishops of *Italy*, (t) *Germany* and *France* met together, and for this decreed that he had done against Christian piety, and deposed him, for that among other things he had divorced Men and their Wives, denying such as had their lawful Wives to be Priests; when yet at the same time he admitted to the Altars, Whoremongers, Adulters and Incestuous persons. *Bellar-*

Bellarmine himſelf and other (*u*) Popiſh Doctors do grant, yea he proves by Arguments that by the Law of God it is not forbidden that Miniſters ſhould Marry, and that for many hundred years the Church of *Rome* permitted *Greek* Prieſts to have and dwell with their Wives.

(*u*) *Aquin.* 2da. 2dæ. Q. 88. art. 11. *Cajet.* Opuſcul. Tom. 1. Tract. 27. Sotus lib. 7. de Juſtitia Q. 6. art. 2. in *Bellar:* de cleric. lib. 1. cap. 18.

Thirdly. *That Religious worſhipping of Images hath not been of old in the Church of God, nor received and owned by Councils,* (for what particular perſons and hereticks in this point have done is not in this Controverſie ſo much to be minded) *nor practiſed in the Church for ſome hundred years after Chriſt, there is ſufficient evidence.* Biſhop *Uſher* in his Anſwer to the Jeſuits Challenge, ſaith, It might well be concluded that Images were brought into the Church partly by lewd Hereticks, partly by ſimple Chriſtians newly converted from Paganiſm. The Gnoſtick Hereticks had Images, ſome painted in Colours, others framed of Gold and Silver, and other matter, which they ſaid were the repreſentations of Chriſt, made under *Pontius Pilate*, when he was converſant here among men; and though *Euſebius* (*w*) makes mention of the Images of *Paul and Peter, and of Chriſt, yet there he calls it an Heatheniſh cuſtom.* But they were ſo far from worſhipping them in the Primitive times, that a Council (*x*) of ancient Fathers did decree about the year 325, *That Pictures ought not be in the Church, leſt that which is worſhipped or adored ſhould be painted on walls.* Which Law made by this Council, ſet *Melchior Canus* (*y*) the Papiſt in ſuch an heat, that he alone would condemn all them not only of imprudency but impiety for ſo doing, for the poor man could not otherwiſe anſwer it.

(*w*) *Euſe.* Eccl. Hiſt. l. 7. c. 18.

(*x*) Concil. *Elibertin.*

(*y*) Illa lex non imprudenter modo, verum etiam impie, à Concilio *Elibertino* lata eſt de tollendis imaginibus. *Canus* loc. Theolog. lib. 5. cap. 4. concluſ. 4.

In the firſt four General Councils there is nothing for the worſhipping of Images, which reached to the year 451, and yet if they had been of that opinion they had had occaſion from what was done in the *Elibertine* Council, being about the ſame time that the *Nicene* Council was, and before the other three.

And it ſhould ſeem that they were not worſhipped in the Church of *Rome* it ſelf for ſix hundred years after Chriſt, by the Epiſtle of *Gregory* the Great to *Serenus* Biſhop of (*z*) *Marſeilles*, who had broken down Images, and caſt them out of his Church, when he perceived ſome to begin to dote upon them too much, *whom though he reproves for breaking of them, yet him he commends for his Zeal, that nothing made with hands ſhould be worſhipped.*----*you ought to reſtrain the people from worſhipping of them, that though the people might have had them, whereby to gather the knowledg of the Hiſtory, but might not ſin in worſhipping the Picture.* Judg if it were likely that at that time Religious Worſhip was given to Images at *Rome*, when the Biſhop thereof condemned it for a ſinful thing, and commends others for being againſt it. And though Cardinal *Bellarmine* was of opinion, *That it is lawful to picture God in the Church in the ſhape*

(*z*) Indico dudum ad nos perveniſſe quod fraternitas veſtra quoſdam Imaginum adoratores aſpiciens, eaſdem Eccleſiæ Imagines confregit atque projecit, & quidem zelum vos, ne quid manu factum adorari poſſit, habuiſſe laudavimus. —— Tua fraternitas, —— ab earum adoratu populum prohibere debuit; —& populus in Picturæ adoratione minime peccaret. *Greg. Mag. Epiſ. lib. 7. Ep. 109.*

of

of a man, and the Holy Ghost in the form of a Dove, yet a greater and one more ancient than he was against it, namely, Pope *Gregory* the second, (a) whose Epistle is related by *Baronius* upon the year 726, whence it seems there was no such Picture in the Church of *Rome* at that time, for saith that Pope, *In the Church God is not represented before mens eyes, and that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is not drawn in colours, because Gods nature cannot be painted out, or put in sight.*

(a) Cur tandem patrem domini Jesu non oculis subjicimus ac pingimus? quoniam quis sit non novimus, Deique natura spectanti proponi non potest ac pingi.

Moreover at a Council of 338 Fathers held at *Constantinople* in the year 754, they were solemnly condemned; and when they were set up by the second Council at *Nice* in the year 787, were degraded again of their honour by the Council of *Francfort* in the year 794.

(b) *Durant.* de ritib. p. 31.

(b) *Durant* purposely sets himself to give us all the Councils that have approved the use and veneration of Images; and saith, the first that did was the sixth Council at *Constantinople* (which was in the time of Pope *Agatho* about the year 673), and quotes the 83, but it is the 82 Canon, (c) where the Picture of Christ is commanded to be made in the shape of a Man, but turning to the place I find plainly that this Canon doth not at all command any Worship to be given to it, but only as Historical, that is nothing to the Popish cause of worshipping of them. Another (saith he) is a second *Nicene* Council, which yet was 787 years after Christ, so that this might pass for a Novelty.

(c) Christi Dei nostri instar hominis characterem etiam in Imaginibus deinceps pro veteri agno statui jubemus, ut per ipsum verbi Dei humiliationem mente comprehendentes, ad memoriam quoque ejus in carne conversationis, ejusque passionis, & salutaris mortis deducamur, ejusque quæ ex eo facta est mundo Redemptionis. *Conc. Constant. VI. Can.* 82.

Fourthly. *The Doctrine of Purgatory*, by the confession of Papists themselves is ranked among the Novelties brought into the Church; for one of them saith, (d) *No true Believer now doubts of Purgatory, whereof notwithstanding among the ancient there is very little or no mention at all. The* Greeks *also to this day do not believe that there is a Purgatory; let who will read the Commentaries of the ancient* Greeks, *and so far as I see, he shall find very rare speech of Purgatory, or none at all. And the* Latins *did not all of them together receive the truth of this matter, but by little and little; neither indeed was the faith either of Purgatory or Pardons so needful in the Primitive Church, as now it is.* Thus far a Papist, and an ingenuous one too, which is rare to find, that will without Partiality speak the truth. Which *Bellarmine* doth not use to do, for he saith quite contrary, *That all the Fathers* (e) *both* Greek *and* Latin *have constantly taught from the Apostles times that there is a Purgatory.* And this Cardinal is in such a heat for Purgatory-fire, that he saith, *That it is a Doctrine of Faith, so that he that doth not believe it, shall never come to it,* (no harm if he do not, I suppose it is no desirable thing to be in pains no less than the pains of Hell, though shorter,) *but shall be always tormented in the flames of Hell.* But the best of it is, that it is but a Cardinal, not the Scripture that saith so. But I will set another Papist upon *Bellarmines* back, and standing

(d) Nemo certe dubitat Orthodoxus, an Purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud Priscos, nulla vel quam rarissima fiebat mentio; sed & Græcis ad hunc usque diem, non est creditum esse, &c. *Joban. Rosse.* apud *Polyd. Virg. de invent. rerum, lib.* 8. *cap.* 1.

(e) *Bellar.* de Purgat. lib. 1. cap. 15.

ſtanding betwixt the two let him ſhift for himſelf, and get out as well as he can, they are the words of *Alphonſus*; (f) *Concerning Purgatory there is almoſt no mention made by the Ancients, eſpecially the* Greek *Writers, for which reaſon to this very day the* Greeks *do not believe that there is a Purgatory.* It is true that many of the Fathers ſpeak of a Purging-fire, both in this life, and after; but by the Purging-fire in this life they underſtand afflictions. So *Auguſtine*, (g) *We confeſs that in this life there are Purgatory pains,------as loſs of friends, and the calamities of this life.* So alſo of a Purging-fire after this life, through which they make all Saints to paſs; by which fire they underſtand, the laſt day of Judgment; but the Popiſh Purgatory is another thing, not invented in the days of *Gregory* the firſt, who did write in the end of the ſixth age, ſaying, (h) *Becauſe we are redeemed by the Grace of our Creator, ſo much we have of heavenly gift, that when we are with-drawn from the habitation of our fleſh, we are preſently brought to the heavenly recompence.* And though in the Writing of this Pope there is ſome mention of Purgatory for ſmaller Sins, yet it is not the ſame that the Papiſts now aſſert; for in his Dialogues he ſpeaks of the Purgation of Souls in Baths, in Rivers, and Wind; and it was firſt bottomed upon Viſions and Revelations, and fained Stories of departed Souls appearing to others in this life, two of which I had Tranſlated, but I find they are too large (for want of room) to be inſerted; the one is to be found in (i) *Gregories* Works, the other in (k) *Bedes* Hiſtory in the yeat 671, and both in the *Magdeburgenſes.*

But above 200 years after theſe pretended Viſions, the Council of *Aquiſgran* (m) do ſhew that this was not a general received Doctrine, who ſhew how men are puniſhed after this life; for they ſum up all the puniſhments inflicted by God for ſin to this life, and they mention two ways, but the *third* (ſay they) *after this life, is very fearful and terrible, which by the moſt juſt judgment of God ſhall be executed, when he ſhall ſay, depart from me ye curſed into everlaſting fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels.* And yet further, to diſcover the Novelty of Purgatory, that it was above a thouſand years but the opinion of ſome particular men, and not an article of Faith generally received. The ſaying of *Otto Frigenſis* (n) writing in the year of our Lord 1146. giveth evidence, his words be theſe; "That there is in Hell a place of Purgatory, wherein ſuch as "are to be ſaved are either only troubled with darkneſs or de-"cocted with the fire of Expiation, SOME do AFFIRM, (*mark Reader*), "all did not teach ſo, nor the moſt; Nor, ſaith he, many, but "ſome only.

Fifthly. *That the Popes Indulgences are a meer Novelty*, that the Church of God for many hundred years knew nothing of; we need look no further evidence than the plain confeſſion of Papiſts themſelves, amongſt whom I find *Alphonſus* making plain and full confeſſion, about theſe Indulgences and Popes Pardons, ſaying, "*That of all the matters treated of in his whole Book, there is not one that the Scripture is more ſilent in, not*

ot

(f) *Alphonſ. de Caſtro*, adverſ. hæreſ. lib. 8. titul. Indulgentia.

(g) *Auguſt.* de civitat. Dei, lib. 22. cap. 13.

(h) Quia authoris noſtri gratia redempti ſumus, hoc jam cœleſtis muneris habemus, ut cum à carnis noſtræ habitatione ſubtrahimur, mox ad cœleſtia præmia ducamur. *Gregor.* 1. in Job 20.

(i) *Gregor.* lib. 4. Dialog. cap. 55.

(k) *Bed.* Eccl. Hiſtor. lib. 5. cap. 13.

(l) *Magdebur.* Centur. 6. pag. 693. Cent. 7. pag. 573, 574.

(m) Capit. *Aquiſgran.* Conc. ad Papinum Miſſ. lib. 1. cap. 1. quoted by Biſhop *Uſher.* Anſw. to Jeſ. Chall. p. 177.

(n) Eſſe apud inferos locum Purgatorium, in quo ſalvandi vel tenebris tantum afficiantur, vel expiationis igne decoquantur, QUIDAM aſſerunt. *Otto Friſ.* lib. 8. Chro. cap. apud eundem.

one that the ancient Writers ſpeak leſs of. (o) Though he would not have them *therefore to be ſlighted, becauſe the uſe of them hath been but lately received, becauſe* (mark what he ſaith,) *many things are known to poſterity, which the ancient Writers were altogether ignorant of. What need we wonder then, if this be ſo in the matter of Indulgences, that among the Ancients there is no mention of them at all?* really this did me good to read, for I love and like that men ſhould be ingenuous, and ſpeak the plain truth. Yet when I read further, and ſaw that he doth acknowledg nothing for it in the Scripture, nor in the ancient Fathers; yet that thoſe that *ſet light by them, or deſpiſe them, ſhould be judged hereticks*, I thought 'twas too much heat in him. This Papiſt makes no attempt at all to go higher than Pope *Gregory* the firſt, in the latter end of the ſixth age, when (he ſaith) *It is ſaid that he granted ſome Indulgences*; and from thence he ſlides as far as the *Laterau* Council, which was in the year of our Lord 1215, (ſo *Caranza*,) and from thence to the Council of *Conſtance* under Pope *John* 24, which was after the year of our Lord 1400. So late; and this is all the Antiquity that he doth pretend unto, from whoſe confeſſion we might ſafely place this among the young Doctrines and practices held and uſed in the Church of *Rome*.

But let us try another of them whoſe buſineſs in his Book is to give the firſt riſe, and beginning of things. (p) He alſo attempts not to riſe higher than the ſixth hundredth year, to the former *Gregory*, but there he finds little to faſten upon, and therefore ſteps preſently back to *Boniface* the 8, who he ſaith was the firſt that brought in the Popiſh Jubilee, when he gave Pardons to thoſe that viſited the Apoſtles Temples, in the year 1300, which Jubilee he commanded ſhould be obſerved every hundredth year. But when fifty years were almoſt expired, Pope *Clement* the ſixth ordained this Jubilee ſhould be every Fifty year, for as much as mans age would not reach the hundredth year. Laſtly, Pope *Sixtus* the fourth (about 1471,) or as my preſent Author 1475, brought it to every 25. year; and *then* (I pray thee Reader mark) *the uſe of Pardons, which they call Indulgences, began to be famous, which Pardons for what cauſe, or by what authority they were brought in, or what they be good for, doth much trouble our Modern Divines to ſhew.* Reader, is not this a plain caſe? can we deſire clearer evidence of the Novelty of the Popes Pardons, by which he beguiles ſo many Souls, and gets ſo much money in-

(o) Inter omnes res de quibus in hoc opere diſputamus, bulla eſt quam minus aperte ſacræ literæ prodiderint, & de qua minus veteres Scriptores dixerint, neq; tamen hac occaſione ſunt condemnandæ [Indulgentiæ] quod earum uſus in Eccleſia videatur ſero receptus: quoniam multa ſunt poſteriori-bus nota, quæ veteres illi Scriptores prorſus ignoraverunt.—— Quid ergo mirum ſi ad hunc modum contigerit de Indulgentiis, ut apud priſcos nulla ſit de eis mentio? —— Etſi pro Indulgentiarum approbatione ſacræ Scripturæ teſtimonium apertum deſit, tamen qui

contemnit, hæreticus merito cenſeatur, &c. *Alphonſ. de Caſtro adver. hæreſ. lib.* 8. *titul. Indulgentiæ.*

(p) *Bonifacius* octavus. —— primus omnium Jubileum retulit, anno qui fuit Mccc ſalutis humanæ, quo pœnarum remiſſionem iis præſtabat, qui limina Apoſtolorum viſitaſſent. —— Idem autem Pontifex Jubileum centeſimo quoq; anno ſervari mandavit. —— Quinquageſimo poſt inſtante anno *Clemens* ſextus ſanxit Jubileum quinquageſimo quoque anno, cum ætas hominis vix Jubileum illum centum annorum attingere poſſit. —— Poſtremo *Sixtus* ejus appellationis quartus Jubileum ad vigeſimum quemque annum reduxit, primuſque celebravit, qui fuit annus MccccLXXV ſalutis, ac ita veniarum quas Indulgentias vocant, jam tum uſus celebris eſſe cæpit, quæ qua de cauſa, quave ex authoritate introductæ fuerint, aut quantum valere videantur, noſtri recentiores Theologi ea de re egregie laborant; ego vero originem, quod mei eſt muneris, quæritans, non reperio ante fuiſſe, quod ſciam, quam divus *Gregorius* ad ſuas ſtationes id præmii propoſuerit. *Poliaur. Virgil. de Invent. rerum lib.* 8. *cap.* 1.

to his treasure; and being so much in the dark himself, he consults another to seek relief; and the third saith, (q) *It may be many will put no great trust to these Indulgences, because their use is but lately come into the Church, and is so found but a little while ago, to whom I say, it is not certain who first began them,* (and he can, doth, go no higher than the sixth hundred year, and then he speaks sparingly,) there was SOME *use of them, and doubtingly, for he gathers it only by consequence.* But this Popish Author whom before we cited, confessing the Novelty of Purgatory, doth also himself conclude, from thence follows the Novelty of Popish Pardons; for saith he, (r) *As long as there was no fear of Purgatory no man sought Indulgences, for all the account of Indulgence depends on Purgatory. If you deny Purgatory, what need of Indulgences? Indulgences began after men were frighted with the pains of Purgatory.* Thus out of the mouths of these three Witnesses of their own we might let this pass for one of the younger sort, and set it amongst its fellows.

(q) Multos fortasse movet Indulgentiis istis non usq; adeo fidere, quod earum usus in Ecclesia videatur recentior, & admodum sero apud Christianos repertus, quibus ego respondeo, non certo constare à quo primum tradi cæperint, fuit tamen, nonnullus earum usus, ut aiunt, apud Romanos vetustissimus, quod ex stationibus intelligi potest. —

(r) Quamdiu nulla fuerat de Purgatorio cura, nemo quærivit Indulgentias, nam ex illo pendet omnis Indulgentiarum existimatio. Si tollas Purgatorium, quorsum Indulgentiis opus erit? Cæperunt igitur Indulgentiæ, postquam ad Purgatorii cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum est. *Johan. Roffen.* in *Luther*, ibid.

6. The *like I may conclude of Prayer for the dead*; for if Purgatory be but a late device, and Indulgences granted for their deliverance be but late, prayer for them to be delivered out of Purgatory, (which is supposed in the manner of the Papists prayers for departed Souls) cannot be of a longer standing, as their Bishop before quoted did rightly argue.

What might be alledged for the Antiquity of praying for the Dead, used indeed in the Church formerly, is nothing to the Popish prayers used now; for it is most evident, that they did not pray in relation to their being in Purgatory which they understood not, nor do their prayers express any such thing, but rather the contrary of their being at rest, which they could not have in Purgatory; therefore whatsoever prayers they were, or to what end, is not my work at present to enquire, till they be proved to be such as Popish prayers for the Dead be, their praying in this sort for them will stand still among the younger practices of the Church of *Rome*.

7. As *for the Novelty of praying to Saints*, Cardinal *Du-Perron* (a man that would have found it, if there had been any such practice in the Primitive Churches) doth freely acknowledg (as *Molinæus* that traced him in his Book affirmeth,) that *as in the holy Scriptures there is neither command nor example for the Invocation of Saints, so likewise in the writings of the Fathers, that have written before the first four Councils* (which brings us to the year 451.) *no trace is to be found of that Invocation.* The distinction betwixt the Saints Intercession, and the Invocation of Saints should be carefully heeded; for whether the Saints in Heaven pray for the

Molin. de Novelt. of Popery, pag. 388.

the Church on Earth, and whether the Church on Earth might pray to the Saints in Heaven, are widely differing; that in the first ages it was accounted Idolatry to invocate Angels was determined in the 35 Canon of the *Laodicean* Council before quoted.

8. To *shew the Novelty of Transubstantiation*; that the substance of the Bread is not turned into the substance of the flesh of Christ, I need not stand long: for *Scotus* doth it for me, who saith, *That this was not a Doctrine of Faith before the* Lateran *Council, which was in the year* 1215. (*s*) Which *Bellarmine* taketh notice of and is offended at, and helps the matter as well as he can, in mentioning one Council, (and he names no more, which he would have done doubtless if any had been) and that is a Council at *Rome* under *Gregory* the 7, who was Pope in the year 1073; so that with *Bellarmines* grave admonition of *Scotus*, it was above a thousand years before that was made a Doctrine of Faith in the *Roman* Church it self. (*t*) But *Alphonsus* as to Councils rises no higher than the *Lateran*, according as *Scotus* did.

9. The *denying of the Cup to the People might be reckoned with the rest, for a meer Novelty*, having its rise in the Council of *Constance* which began in the year 1414, and there needs no other evidence, that this is an Innovation, than the very words of the Canon, whereby it is denied to the People, which are, (*u*) *Although Christ did administer this Sacrament in both kinds, and though in the Primitive Church the People did receive it in both kinds, yet this custom is rationally introduced,----that the People shall only take the Bread,----and we command under pain of Excommunication that no Presbyter give it to the People under both kinds of Bread and Wine.* See Reader, though Christ appointed both, though the Primitive time observed both, yet these say they shall have but one, any thing in Christs command, and the Churches practice for so many hundred years to the contrary notwithstanding; for this it was called deservedly by one *Concilium Non obstantiense*, instead of *Constantiense*.

The practice of the Church of *Rome* decreed by this Council is but two hundred and odd years standing; and yet after this the Council of *Basil* granted the use of the Cup to the *Bohemians*; and again the Council of *Trent* denied it; so that Popish Councils can say and unsay, do and undo, and that in matters of Faith, where dissenters must be Hereticks, and yet cannot err, and that's pity.

10. The *Adoration of the Sacrament was after the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*; for the reason of their worshipping of it, is because it is changed into Christs Body and Blood; the first then being new, the other cannot be old; the first brought in as an Article of Faith in the time of *Innocent* the third 1215, the worshipping of it in the time of *Honorius* (*w*) the third in the year 1216. Behold its Antiquity!

11. The *practice of the Popes canonizing of Saints is a new invention by the confession of* Bellarmine *himself*, (*x*) who acknowledg that the first Pope that he ever read of was *Leo* the third 800 years after Christ. And the same Cardinal saith, That no Saints might be publickly Invocated

(*s*) *Bellar.* de Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 23.
(*t*) *Alphons. de Castro* adver. hæres. tit. Euchar. hæres.
(*u*) Licet Christus post cænam instituerit, & suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis & vini hoc venerabile Sacramentum, & similiter licet in Primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus sub utraq; specie, tamen hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula & scandala, est rationabiliter introducta, ——— quod à laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur, &c. *Concil. Constan. Sess.* 13.
(*w*) Decret. *Greg.* IX. lib. 3. tit. 41. cap. 10.
(*x*) Primus Pontifex (ni forte fallor) qui sanctos legatur Canonizasse, videtur fuisse *Leo* Papa III, antequam fortasse fuerunt aliæ, sed non mihi constat. *Bellar.* de sanct. Beat. lib. 1. cap. 8.

that are not Canonized by the Pope, put both together, and it will make a clear conſequence, that Invocation of Saints at leaſt publickly was not for 800 years after Chriſt, the Papiſts themſelves being Confeſſors.

But whither do I tend? to run over all Particulars controverted betwixt us and them would ſooner ſwell into a Volumn, than be contained in a Sermon; I can therefore but name ſome other Points, and let it be ſhewn that for five, ſix, ſeven hundred, yea ſome for a thouſand years after Chriſt, that they were generally owned or received in the Church of Chriſt, ſuch as theſe added to the former.

12. The Infallibility of the Biſhop of *Rome*.

13. That the Church of *Rome* is the only Church, founded by God himſelf, or that the Church of *Rome* is the Catholick Church.

14. That there is no Salvation out of the *Roman* Church.

15. That all that the Church of *Rome* delivers is to be believed, whether it be written in the Word of God or no.

16. That the Pope or Ch. of *R.* hath Power & Authority to make Doctrins of Faith, neceſſary to Salvation, that are not contained in the Scripture.

17. That the Pope of *Rome* alone, or his Council alone, or Pope and Council together are the Judg of Controverſies, to whom Appeals from all the Churches muſt be made, and all bound to acquieſce in their, or his Determinations.

18. That the Pope of *Rome* might judg all but be judged by none, nor be blamed though he leads Souls by troops to Hell.

19. That the Pope of *Rome* hath Temporal Juriſdiction over Princes, Kings and Emperours, to depoſe them from their Thrones, diſpoſe of their Crowns, and abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance to their lawful Princes.

20. That the Pope of *Rome* hath Authority to diſpenſe with the Law of God, to make that lawful which God forbids, and that evil which God commands.

21. That the Power of calling General Councils is inherent in the Pope.

22. That the Pope by himſelf, or Legats ought to be Preſident in ſuch Councils.

23. That all that General Councils do determine without his Authoritative Ratification, is of no force, but void.

24. That the Scripture is imperfect and inſufficient, containing in it not all things neceſſary to Salvation, nor for the refuting of all Hereſies.

25. That it is not lawful to interpret Scripture contrary to the ſenſe of the Church of *Rome*.

26. That the Church doth not depend upon the Scripture, but the Authority of the Scripture, even *quoad nos*, upon the teſtimony of the Church of *Rome*.

27. That the Scripture ought not to be Tranſlated into the Vulg. Tong.

28. That the common People are to be debarred from reading of the Scriptures except they have a Licenſe from the Biſhop.

29. That the publick Service and Prayers in the Church ought to be in an unknown Tongue.

30. That

30. That there are ſeven proper Sacraments, Baptiſm, Confirmation, Lords-Supper, Penance, Extream Unction, Matrimony, Ordination: Or that there are eight Sacraments of Order, as the Order of Porters, Readers, Exorciſts, Servitors, Sub-Deacons, Deacons, Presbyters and Biſhops; to make indeed fourteen or fifteen Sacraments.

31. That the Sacrament of Confirmation is more worthy than the Sacrament of Baptiſm, and is to be had in greater reverence, and accordingly to be done only by a Biſhop, when Baptiſm by a Presbyter.

32. That private Maſſes are lawful, and in them both Clergy and Laity to be deprived both of the Bread and Wine, except the Prieſt that makes it, by the reſt only to be ſeen.

33. That the Euchariſt when it is ſent unto the Sick is to be adored by all that meet it, and thoſe that do not, to be accounted Hereticks, and to be perſecuted with Fire and Sword.

34. That it is a Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead, for obtaining not only Spiritual but Temporal Bleſſings, to be offered to God for Health, ſucceſs in Battels, for their Horſes and their Hogs.

35. That a juſtified perſon may truly and properly make ſatisfaction to God for the guilt of puniſhment, which remains to be expiated after the fault is remitted.

36. That the ſatisfactory Works of the Saints may be communicated and applied to others, or that there are Works of Supererogation.

37. That Abſolution by a Prieſt is ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that perſons believing in Chriſt are damned if they die before they be abſolved by a Prieſt.

38. That the Confirmation of Biſhops, and Inſtitution of Arch-Biſhops by the Pall is to be ſought by the Pope of *Rome*, from all parts and quarters of the World, without which they are no ſuch Officers, and cannot without Sacriledg execute their Office.

39. That in Baptiſm there is an Implicite Vow of Obedience to the Pope of *Rome*.

40. That the Decret. Epiſt. are to be reckoned amongſt Can. Scripture.

41. That the Biſhop of *Rome* if he be Canonically ordained, whatſoever he were, is undoubtedly made holy by the Merits of St. *Peter*.

42. That every tranſgreſſion of the Law deſerveth not death, but that there are many ſins of themſelves and in their own nature venial and deſerving pardon, that the Blood of Chriſt is not neceſſary to waſh them away, but may be done away with holy Water, knocking the breſt, and by the Biſhops bleſſing.

43. That Clergy-men are exempted from the Juriſdiction of Temporal Lords in things Civil and Criminal, and that the Civil Judg cannot puniſh Eccleſiaſtical perſons.

44. That the Rebellion of a Clergy-man againſt the King is not Treaſon, or that it is meritorious to kill Princes Excommunicated by the Pope.

45. That good Works in themſelves have a proportion, and condignity with the reward, and are meritorious from their inward worthineſs,

to

to be worth the reward, as a Journey-man is of his wages for his labour. Papists themselvs do acknowledg that the first beginning of some of their Doctrines they cannot tell, and to search for the year when every Novelty was introduced is needless, all these that are named, are not in Scripture, nor in the Primitive Church, some not for 4, 5, some not for 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 hundred years, that I might conclude that Popery is a very Novelty, and doth vainly and falsly boast of its Antiquity.

I. *Use.* 1. Is Popery a new Way, and the Religion of Protestants the old Religion taught by Christ and his Apostles, then this is *a safe Way, and a safe Religion*; in it you may be justified, sanctified, and surely saved. It is the old Way that *Paul*, and *Peter*, and Believers in the Primitive times obtained an everlasting Kingdom and Crown. Be not frighted with the uncharitable and groundless Doctrine of the Papists, that *out of their Church there is no Salvation.* 2. *Then it is the wisest Way*; the folly of men shews it self in the new Ways of Popery, and wherein they profess themselves to be wise, they are become fools; but in the old Way is manifest the manifold Wisdom of God. 3. Then it is *the purest Way*; the nearer the Fountain the purer are the Streams; the nearer the Copy the fairer is the Writing; the Church of *Rome* doth vainly glory in Titles of Holiness; *the most holy Pope*; *the holy Church*; *the multitude of Holy Days*, *holy Rites and Ceremonies*, *&c.* that is holy and pure, that is consonant to the holy and pure Word of God. If you are to travel you would go the cleanest way; you are travelling to an everlasting state, the old Way of Faith in Christ Repentance for Sin, inward Holiness and new Obedience taught in the Reformed Churches, agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ, and his Apostles, is the cleanest Way that you can go in, to keep a clean and pure Heart, a clean and pure Conscience, to have a clean and pure Conversation. 4. It is *the neerest Way*; if you leave this Way, the further you go, the more you are out of your Way. You go about, you must back again, or you go on to a place where there is no rest night nor day, but the smoke of their torment ascendeth for ever and ever. 5. Then it is the *most comfortable and most pleasant Way*; all the Ways of Wisdom are Ways of pleasantness, and all her Paths are peace. It might be strowed with outward troubles, briars and thorns may be in this Way, but there is inward peace, and inward joy, and solid, sure and lasting comfort to be found in it. 6 *Then it is the only Way*; The Way of Faith in Christ, the Way of Regeneration and Holiness, the Way of new Obedience and Perseverance therein is the old Way to Heaven, and there is no other. If you will choose new Ways your selves, or walk in new Ways chalked out by others, contrary to the good old Way, you will lose God and Christ and your Souls for ever.

II *Use.* 1. *Get a right understanding of the greatness of your mercy*; that you were not born in times and places of Popery, that you have Ministers to teach you the good old Way, & Magistrates to defend you therein; that you are not burned at a Stake for not receiving new Popish Doctrines; that you have Bibles, and not burned for having of them. Know your

your mercy. 2. *Bless God for this mercy*, when you understand how great it is: Indeed when you rightly know it, and duly weigh it, you will bless God that you were not brought up in Popish darkness and Idolatry, that you were not brought up to worship Images, pray to Saints, &c. but God alone. 3. *Pray to God for the continuance of this mercy to you & to your children after you*; that Popery might never return, but the Generations to come might be taught the Protestant Religion, that is, the good old Way to Heaven. That your *children, and childrens children* might enjoy the Bible, and have the old Truths of God preached to them. For their sakes pray much. 4. *Then walk in this good old Way*; if you see the Way to Happiness and not walk in it, you will fall short of it. You might be Protestants in opinion, and yet be for ever damned. A drunken Protestant, a whoring Protestant, a swearing, impenitent, unbelieving Protestant, shall not be saved, because in opinion he is a Protestant. You might refuse to commit Idolatry in bowing to, and worshipping of Images, and yet go to Hell for making an Idol of your Money, and over-loving of the World. You might renounce the Pope as Head, and in judgment own Christ, as only Head of his Church, and yet be damned for not believing on him, choosing of him before all, nor loving him above all.

Let all old corrupt things be done away; As (1) your *old Ignorance*. (2) Your *old false-hopes*, (3) Your *old self-love*. (4) Your *old false peace*. (5) Your *old enmity* against God and Holiness. (6) You must be cut off from *the old Stock*. In a word, (for I can but name a few of many that might be said for the practical Improvement of this Text) crucifie the old man, destroy the body of Sin. For to keep your old hearts and yet think to go to Heaven is to look for a new Way of Salvation.

Let all things be new, none can walk in the old Way but who are new Creatures. (1) Your Understandings must be new; new valuations of Christ. (2) Your Wills new; new Elections of Christ. (3) Your Affections new. 1. *New Love* to God, to Christ, his Ways, his People, his Precepts. 2. *New Desires*; Oh that I had God for my Father, Christ for my Lord and Saviour, Grace as a Pledg of Glory. 3. *New Sorrows*, for walking in a way of Sin so long, neglecting Christ so long, Swearing so much, Praying so little. 4. *New Delights*. 5. *New Hatred*. (4) As Affections new, so your *Ends must be new*, Gods Glory. 5. *New Cares* to get, keep a good Conscience, to live holy, die happily and to be saved eternally.

Except you be thus made new, you might know the good old Way, but you cannot walk in it; which if you do not, *Wo, wo, a thousand woes* to you for ever. A Damned Protestant! How! a Damned Protestant! that was to'd which was the good old and only Way, that lived under the constant, plain and powerful preaching of the same Doctrines that Christ himself and his Apostles did deliver. I profess your case will be worser, and your torments will be greater, than the Heathen who might say, *Lord we never had a Bible, never heard of Christ, nor of the way of Salvation; no Ministers were sent to us, no Gospel preached to us.* Yea, worser will be your case, and greater will be your damnation than of many amongst the Papists that have not been so *plainly taught*, so *frequently instructed*, so *faithfully warned*, so *earnestly intreated* as you have been. You are not told, that *Ignorance is the mother of Devotion*, as they be, you are not kept from reading of the Scripture, as they be, but are pressed, urged and exhorted to it. You have not publick Worship in an unknown Tongue, but by plain Language are you warned of Hell, commanded in the name of God to forsake your old wicked ways; how oft have you been perswaded to come to Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life? How long hath God waited? and will you on in your wicked ways still; in your old course of Profaneness and Lying, and Sabbath-breaking? in your old course of careless neglect of God, and Christ, and your own Immortal Souls? that's an old Way indeed, but it is not the good old Way. If you will go on, take your course, if you will not turn to the good Path, take what falls. But know that the Way of Sin leadeth directly unto Hell. Proceed a little further, go on a little longer, and thou wilt drop into a bottomless pit, and be a damned wretch, and take up thy everlasting lodgings with the *old Dragon*, with the *old Serpent*; and canst thou there have rest? Rest! how canst thou under the heavy load of Gods wrath? Rest! how canst thou under the strokes of an angry, provoked and revenging God?

Thou

Thou canſt not reſt upon a bed of Down, when thy Conſcience is ſcared, & God afflict thee with the *Stone* or *Plague*, or *Burning Fever*, though all thy friends be round about thee, adminiſtring Cordials & Comforts to thee. And canſt thou reſt in a bed of flames, in a burning fiery furnace, in a place more dreadful and more hot than is a veſſel full of boiling Lead, and burning Brimſtone; when thy Conſcience ſhall be awakened, the Worm gnawing within thee, the Devils round about thee, and an angry God above thee, and not one nigh thee to pity or relieve thee? For Gods ſake, Sirs, and for your Souls ſake, as ever you would avoid endleſs, & eaſleſs, & remedileſs torments hereafter, walk in the good old Way of Faith and Holineſs, Repentance and new Obedience now.

And if you would now walk in this good old Way, you ſhall (1) be taken into a *New Covenant*. (2) And have *new employment*, better, more noble, more profitable, more pleaſant than ever yet you were engaged in. (3) You ſhall be taken into *new Relations* to be the Sons of God, the Daughters of God, the Servants, People and Friends of God. (4) You ſhall become a new Habitation for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (5) You will have ground of comfort when you *come to die*. Death is the old Way into another World; and if you walk in the good old Way while you live, you may be comforted, if you can appeal to God, having the witneſs of a good Conſcience, and ſay, *Now Lord remember how I have walked before thee in the good path with an upright heart*. And then (6) you ſhall enter into the *New Jeruſalem* where you ſhall have (1) Univerſal, total Reſt. (2) Seaſonable Reſt. (3) Eternal, and (4) Delightful Reſt; And that (1) from *Sin*, from the reigning, and conflicting power of Sin, from the guilt and in-dwelling of Sin. (2) Reſt from the *Temptations* of Satan, he ſhall never trouble nor diſquiet you more. Commiſſion of Sin is now a burden to you, and temptation to Sin is now a burden to you, but the good old Way will bring to reſt from both. (3) Reſt from all *Afflictions* from God upon your Bodies; now Sickneſs is a burden that makes you to be reſtleſs, but then you ſhall have an aking Head no more, pained Bowels, a ſick Heart no more for ever. (4) Reſt from all *Troubles* from men, no more impriſoned, perſecuted; reſt from all their ſlanders and reproaches, &c. (5) Reſt from all *thoſe holy Duties* that are now as a means to bring you to this Reſt. You ſhall reſt from Repentings and Mournings for Sin, from all the pains that now you are at to mortifie corruption; though not from loving of God, delighting in God, and admiring of his Love, nay this your Love ſhall be one part of your Reſt. (6) Reſt from all *doubts* and *fears*, and *jealouſies* of heart. Now you doubt, doth God love me? do I love God? is Chriſt mine, and am I his? will God ſave me? pardon me? ſometimes (thou ſaiſt) I hope he will, and that doth lighten my heart; ſometimes I fear he will not, and that's a burden. Oh it is an heavy burden to my Soul, under which I cannot reſt. But this good old Way will bring thee to a reſt where thou ſhalt doubt no more, and fear no more. Canſt thou doubt whether it be day when thou ſeeſt the Sun doth ſhine? or that fire is hot, when thou ſeeſt it burn, and feeleſt it doth warm thy hand? no more ſhalt thou doubt, when thou comeſt to the end of thy walk in the good old Way, whether God doth love thee, when thou ſhalt be filled with his Love, and feel that he doth love thee, and ſee to what a bleſſed place of reſt, and peace, of life, of light and joy, his Love hath brought thee to. (7) Reſt from all *Diſertions*; God ſhall no more frown, no more depart, or withdraw from thee for ever. (8) Reſt from all thy *worldly labours* and *employments*; when thou haſt now wearied thy ſelf in thy calling all the day, thou takeſt thy reſt at night, and oh how ſweet is reſt when thou art weary; but when the day returns thy labour alſo doth return, and thy noble Soul by mean and low imployment (yet thy duty while thou art here) one in making *Bricks*, another *Pins*, one in working in *wood*, another in *Silk*, or *Silver* and *Gold*, poor employment for a Rational Soul, by reaſon whereof God hath few of thy thoughts, little of thy delight and love; and doth diſtract thee often in thy holy duties; but this Way will bring thee to a Reſt from all theſe, when God ſhall have all thy thoughts, delight and love. Stand then & ſee which is the good old Way. Nay you do ſee which is it; God hath ſhewed it unto you, it is chalked marked out before you; Reſt you are promiſed, and Reſt you ſhall find in walking in it; But let none of you ſay in words, or heart, by your practice, we will not walk therein, leſt you come unto a place of torment, where you NEVER ſhall have REST.

SERMON

SERMON VIII.

No Sin Venial.

ROMANS 6. 23.

The Wages of Sin, is Death.

IT was a Cenſure more *true* than ſmart, which a late learned Pen, publickly in this expreſſion pronounced againſt Popery, *Romana Religio in quantum differt a noſtra, eſt mera Impoſtura*: *The* (now *Roman Religion* (*as it differs from ours*) *is a meer Cheat, Juggle, or* (kind of) *Religious Legerdemain.* And herein the Impoſture of that Religion eminently appears, in that under the Varniſh of *Chriſtian*, moſt of it ſeems calculated only for hooking in of *worldly gain*, and promoting of ſecular advantage. What Bp. *Senhouſe* (the *Cambridg Chryſoſtom* of his time) ſaith in his Sermon upon *Acts* 19. 28, concerning *Demetrius* and his Fellow Crafts-men, their crying of, *Great is the Diana of the Epheſians*; *the Shrines of Diana cauſing their Shrieks for Diana, and their great Gain by her, raiſing up their great Cry for her, ſhewed there was* dolus in Idolo, *deceit in their Contention for the Idol*; may as truly be ſaid of the *Romiſh Demetrius*, the Pope and the Popiſh Prieſts, their eager out-cry in the Defence of the Points of Popery, it being not *Chriſt* but *Mammon*, not *Piety* but *Money*, not *God* but *Gold*, that ingageth them in their advancing of their Doctrines and Devotions. As Saint *Ambroſe* ſpake of *Benjamins* Sack, *Sacco ſoluto apparuit argentum*, when *the Sack was looſed, the Silver appeared*; reſolve the moſt of their Theology into that whereof 'tis Conſtituted, and Silver (Gain I mean) will be found to be the chief Element of its Conſtitution. Of this their own Writers are fitteſt Witneſſes, whom I have cited in their own words; for proving of this my Accuſation. *Æneas Silvius* (afterwards Pope) informs us, That *the Roman Court gives nothing without Silver*; *It ſells* (ſaith he) *the Impoſition of Hands, the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt*; *nay is Pardon of Sin*

Doctor *Prideaux* Lect.

Gen. 44. 11, 12.

Nihil eſt quod abſq; argento Romana Curia dedat; Ipſa manuum impoſitio & Spiritus Sancti dona venduntur, nec peccatorum veniæ niſi nummata impenditur. *Æneas Silvi* Ep 56.

given

Venalia nobis Templa, Sacerdotes, Altaria, Sacra, Coronæ, ignis, thura, preces, Cœlum est venale, Deusq; *Mantu.* l. 3.

Si quid Roma dabit, nugas dabit, accipit aurum, verba dat; heu Romæ nunc sola pecunia regnat. *B. Mantuan.* Eclog. 5. & 9.

In proverbium jamdudum abiit Romana permutio, plumbi videlicet cum auro. *Duaren. de Sac. Ec. Min.* l. 1. c. 6.

Regina rerum pecunia, divitibus licitum facit quod in pauperibus est illicitum. *Claud. Espens. Digr.* 2. *ad cap.* 1. *Ep. ad Tit.*

Si spes refulserit nummi, quod interdictum fuit prius, jam liberè fit & impune. Quod vetatur, numerata pecunia Dispensatur, quasi nullum sit peccatum majus, quam nummis carere, ut Ille apud *Horatium Ep.* 2. Credidit ingens pauperiem vitium; & ut alter, *l.* 3. nunc sit Barbaries grandis habere nihil. Taxa non excipit Presbytericidas, paricidas, matricidas, incestos, deniq; *Contra naturam cum Brutis*, &c. *Espen.* in *Tit. p.* mihi 478, 479. Si nihil numeraveris, indispensatus manes. Id.—Clericos cum pellicibus cohabitare, liberosq; procreare sinunt, accepto ab eis quotannis certo censu, atque adeo alicubi a continentibus; habeant, aiunt si velint.

given to any but such as are well-Monied. A Poet of their own faith, That *with them, Temples, Priests, Altars, Prayers, yea Heaven, and* God *himself, are all set to Sale for Money*; and that *Rome gives Trifles and takes Gold.* Another relates, That *Romana permutatio auri cum plumbo*, The *Roman change, of Lead for Gold, was grown into a Proverb. Only Money reigns at Rome* (thus speaks another) *and makes that lawful for the Rich which is unlawful for the Poor*; and (as he goes on) *lay down but Money, and then that which was forbidden before as an heinous wickedness, shall now be dispensed with, and made no sin*; *but without Money, there is no Dispensation*: and (as my Author *Claudius Espensæus* mournfully proceeds) *the vice they esteem greatest, is to want Money*, *and to have nothing, is the greatest piece of Barbarity among them*; and (as that plain-dealing Papist adds) *to heighten their abomination, they allow their very Clergy-men to dwell with Whores and Harlots, and to beget Bastards for a certain Tax, which they do not only receive of the Adulterous, but even of the Continent and Innocent persons*; *alledging for this, that even these might have taken Whores also if they had pleased.* I blush to translate what he adds, namely, That *Bastards, Thieves, Adulterers, perjured Persons, are not only absolved for Money, but admitted to all Dignities and Spiritual Benefices*; *and for Money, Dispensations are granted for Murders, though of Presbyters, Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, Sisters, yea of Wives, nay, for Witchcraft, Incest with the nearest of kin*; *and* (which is most amazing) *for uncleanness*, Contra naturam cum Brutis, *for the* (not-to-be-named) *Sin of Bestiality.* And *Rivet* tells us in his Castigation of *Petra-Sancta the Jesuit*, That *there came to his hands a Book, written by one* Tossanus Denys, *printed* 1500. *at* Paris, *Cum Privilegio*, where in *fol.* 38, are taxed at a *certain Rate, all Absolutions in the Court of* Rome *for murdering of Brethren and Sisters, Fathers, Mothers, Wives, and for the carnal knowledg of a Mans Sister or Mother, pro eo qui Sororem, Matrem carnaliter cognovit*, in his 37 page of his *Jesuita vapulans*. *Chemnitius* in his *Examen* concerning the Point of *Indulgences*, gives us a Copy of Verses written over the Altar in a Popish Cathedral, of which Verses when I read them in *Chemnitius*, I could hardly say whether they more proved my foregoing *Accusation* of, or provoked my just *indignation* against *Popery*, that *Master-piece of painted Atheism.* All the Verses of that pitiful piece of Poetry, are too many to set down, some of them are these:

Ut tibi sit pœnæ venia sit aperta crumena,
Hic datur exponi Paradisus venditioni,
Hic si large des, in Cœlo sit tua sedes.
Pro solo nummo gaudebis in æthere summo.

The

The ſum whereof, and the reſt, is but this, *Lay down your Money, and doubt not of getting up to Glory.* The *Romiſh Jeroboam*, I mean the *Pope*, ſets up the two *Calves* of his golden *Faith* and *Worſhip* to preſerve to himſelf his carnal Kingdom; of which Faith and Worſhip, the greateſt part is purely ſubſervient to the *Popes*, either *Coffer* or *Kitchin*, and of which *Kingdom*, more truly than of *War*, Money may be ſaid to be the *Soul* and *Sinews*. If their Doctrines may be witneſſes to prove ſo clear an accuſation, I might produce a far greater number than is needful to make up an *ordinary Jury*, by mentioning thoſe of *Auricular Confeſſion*, *Pilgrimages*, *Penance*, *Images*, *Prayers for the Dead*, *Indulgences*, *Purgatory*, *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Merits*, *Holineſs of places*, *breaking faith with Hereticks*, *the Popes Superiority over Princes*, *diſpenſation with Oaths*; *and this before us*, *of Venial Sin.* All theſe arrows, if they were not *level'd* at the *mark of Gain*, yet ſure I am, they moſt exactly *hit* and *center* in it (ſtrange they ſhould meet ſo *unitedly* if ſhot at *rovers*); if you conſult the generality of their Doctrines, moſt of the Queſtions in the *Popiſh* Catechiſm, may eaſily be reduced to this *one*, *What ſhall we get for our Paunches and Purſes?* A Catechiſm not compos'd by *Peter* the Popes pretended Predeceſſor (who though he ſaid, *Silver and Gold have I none*; yet alſo ſaid, *thy Money periſh with thee*); but by *Judas* his *bag-bearing pattern*, in that queſtion of his for betraying of Chriſt,—— *Quid dabitis? What will you give me?* 'Twas ingenuouſly ſpoken by a late Poet, when he thus verſify'd;

An Petrus Romæ fuerit, ſub judice lis eſt
Simonem Romæ nemo fuiſſe negat.
We are not ſure that Peter *ever ſat*
In Rome, *but* Simon *did, w'are ſure of that.*

Simon, that *Simon* who barter'd and chaffer'd for the Spirit with Money, is *conſtant Reſident* at *Rome*, where ſome hundreds of years, in many thouſands of Bargains, he hath been as *ſucceſsful* in *ſelling to fools*, as ever was his Predeceſſor *inſucceſsful* in his attempt to buy of the Apoſtles. Among all their Doctrines of this *earthen* and *muddy* complexion, we ſhall this day, more particularly produce this of *Venial Sin*, principally both *ſet up*, and *ſhor'd up*, that the pretended puniſhment of thoſe in Purgatory, may be bought off by money, and that without any *beholdingneſs* to the *blood of Chriſt*, provided the Purſe will but bleed *freely*, as drawn by *Romiſh Prieſts*, the common *Purſe-leeches*, or religious *Cut-purſes* of the Chriſtian World; and from hence it was that Sins, by Papiſts call'd pardonable, have been rather termed *ſaleable*, *venalia* not *venialia*, with a very ſmall and *venial* alteration of the word *venial*.

I wonder not therefore that *Bellarmine* in his firſt Chapter of *Venial Sin*, thus ſets out, *We teach* (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *by common conſent, That there are ſome Sins which of their own nature, do not render a man guilty of eternal death, but only of temporal puniſhment.* To which Expreſſion of his, Orthodox *Ames* thus replys, *Nos unanimi conſenſu negamus illud quod* Bellarminus

Nos docemus communi conſenſu, peccata quædam, ex naturâ ſuâ, hominem non reddere mortis æternæ reum, ſed tantum ſupplicii temporalis. *Bellar. c. 1. de Pœc. Ven.*

Nos unanimi conſenſu negamus illud quod *Bellarminus* affirmat communi conſenſu doceri. *Ames, Bellar. Enerv. l. 2. c. 1.*

minus *affirmat, communi consensu doceri. We* (Protestants) *deny with an unanimous consent, that which* Bellarmine *affirms is taught* (*among them*) *with common consent.* My Work this day, is to declare my Concurrence with our Protestant Divines, in their denial and detesting the blasphemous Doctrine of *Venial Sin.* Only I cannot but mention as an encouraging entrance into this approaching Employment, the *warinesse* of *Bellarmines* Expression, in these words, *Communi consensu docemus*; we teach by *common consent*; for he could not say (as Dr. *Ames* his Answerer) we teach our Doctrine herein with *unanimous consent.* For (as *Medina* an eminent Papist confesseth) *the Popish Doctors are infinitely at odds, and disagree among themselves in finding out, how a Venial and a Mortal Sin differ.* 'Tis true the black Regiment, or rather the *forlorn Adventurers* of the Antichristian Army, strike home, and speak out for their General the Pope, and his Cause in this Point. *Bellarmine* tells us, That some Sins are so far from deserving eternal punishment, that *God cannot punish them eternally without injustice. Gregory de Valentia* saith, *That Venial Sin may be remitted without any infusion of Grace. Sonnius* (the Papist I mean), That *they deserve pardon. Alphonsus a Castro*, That *Peccatum veniale non valet privare gratia*; *Sin Venial cannot deprive of grace.* And that wretched *Andradius* (the worst of the Crew), with his more devout brother *Bonaventure* asserts, That for *Venial Sins we do not so much as need Repentance.* The Provincial Council of *Mentz* dictate, *That many depart this life, free from Mortal Sins, and for lighter Sins they shall never be damned; and that it can hardly be understood how God should be just, should he punish any for Venial Sins with eternal punishment.* And that *Concilium Senonense* declares, *That he who dies involv'd in Venial Sins* (among which it particularly mentions *idle words*, of which Christ saith, *We must give an account, and by which we shall be condemned*, Mat. 12. 37.) *though he be unfit for Heaven, yet neither is it fit he should go to Hell, as being a partaker of Grace, but is to be purged by the fire of Purgatory, out of which he is to be delivered by the prayers of the living*; *and that whosoever thinks otherwise, is guilty of the* Lutheran, Wiclevian *and* Waldensian *Heretical pravity.*

As for that Council (if we may so call the *Conventicle*) of *Trent*, it requires that *all Bishops should take care, that Prayers and the Sacrifices of the Mass, should be devoutly offered for the dead, and accurately performed to free them from the punishment of Venial Sin.* The same *Trent.* Assembly

Quâ ratione distinguatur peccatum veniale à mortali, non una est sententia Doctorum, sed variant in infinitum Doctores. *Medin. in* 1, 2. *q.* 88. *a.* 1.

Cum multi ex hac vitâ migrent, à lethalibus quidem criminibus immunes; levioribus tamen alius alio magis implicatus, quorum tamen nemo, sive ob pluta, sive pauciora hæc delicta quotidiana, damnationem æternam sustinebit: non facilè modus invèniri posset, quomodo Deus (qui est

in omnibus & erga omnes justissimus) non injustus videretur, si non post hanc vitam, per temporales & non æternas pœnas, omnium compensatio expectaretur. *Bin. Tom.* 9. *c.* 46. *p. mihi* 322. Cum peccati tantum venialis reus, repente nonnunquam intereat, de omni verbo etiam otioso rationem redditurus, nec illi pateat aditus ad Cœlestem Hierusalem, in quam nihil intrat coinquinatum; nec item Gehennæ subjaceat, quippe qui gratiæ sit particeps, ac pœnæ tantum temporalis debitor; fit ut primum purgetur ex iis quæ gessit in corpore, salvus tandem aliquando futurus, sic tamen quasi per ignem. *Bin. Tom.* 9. *p. mihi* 198. Curent Episcopi ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera quæ pro fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, piè & devote fiant. *Bin. Tom.* 9. *Sess.* 25. *Conc. Trid. p. mihi* 419 & *Sess.* 14. *c.* 7. *p. mihi* 389.

clearly

clearly discovers that they hold, that 'tis not necessary to confess Venial Sins. 'Tis true therefore (as I said), that those hired slaves of the Pope, those *tearingly* expresse themselves in the asserting of *Venial Sin*. But yet 'twas honestly said by *Bellarmine* however, That this Doctrine of the *Veniality of Sin*, is taught (in the Antichristian Synagogue) only with a *common* (not an *unanimous*) *consent*. For the learnedst of the Papists, as *Vega*, *Altissiodorensis*, *Almain*, *Azorius*, *Durand*, *Fisher* of *Rochester*, (who lost his Head for his maintaining the Popes Headship) but especially *Gerson* Chancellor of *Paris*, liberally assert that all *Sin is mortiferous or deadly*; and that none is Venial, or deserving of Pardon: To all which I add that for the first seven hundred years after Christ, the Doctrine of *Venial Sin* was *never* taught by any *Father*, or *Doctor*, or maintain'd in any *Council*. Nor can *Bellarmine*, after his strictest search into the Fathers, nor could he, nor dares he name *one* of them that ever us'd the very name or word of *Venial Sin*. This being premised as an encouragement to our conflict, namely that the best Soldiers of the Enemies Army, are come over to our side (a sign of their ensuing overthrow,) you may take up the truth of this Doctrine concerning *Venial Sin*, either in an affirmative or negative Proposition (which you please): If in an *Affirmative*, receive it thus; *Every Sin is of its own nature mortiferous and deadly, deserving eternal punishment.* If in a *Negative*, take it thus; *No Sin deserves pardon*, or thus, *No Sin is exempted from deserving eternal death*; or (as 'tis usually expresst), *No Sin is Venial in its own nature*. In the discussing this great Truth, I shall (God willing) discourse,

The main Point.

By way of { 1. Explication. 2. Confirmation. 3. Application.

I. In the Explication I shall proceed by way of

1. *Concession*, or granting what is not to be deny'd.
2. By way of *Negation*, or denial of what is not to be granted; that by both, the question may be *clean'd*, by being freed from the *fogs* of *Popish* Objections.

I. For the first way of *Explication*, *viz.* of *Concession*, I grant,

1. *All private offences of man against man, have a pardon from man due to them*; and that 'tis so, the Scriptures fully discover, *Ephes.* 4. 32. *Col.* 3. 13. *Rom.* 12. *&c.* in requiring *mutual forgiveness*. 'Tis well expresst by *Chamier*, *There's no sin of any against us, but is Venial.* But how weak is *Bellarmines* argument from hence, to prove that *Venial Sins* do not hinder God from loving us. *If all offences* (saith he) *dissolve the love of God, by the same reason should they dissolve love and friendship between man and man; but this they do not; therefore, &c.*

Nullum est peccatum cujusquam in nos, non veniale. *Chamier Panstr. de pec. ven. p. mihi* 182. Eâdem ratione concludere possit *Bellarminus* Deum teneri peccata hominibus remittere quia homines inimicos suos diligere debent, & injurias ipsis quoad vindictam condonare. *Anus, Bellar. Enerv. de Ven. pec. p.* 11.

I an-

Non est æquum, hominum in homines officia æquari officiis hominum in Deum, itaque neque peccata. Ac proinde nullum est peccatum cujusquam in nos, non veniale, at hominum in Deum nullum veniale; multa certe mortalia ipsis fatentibus Papistis. *Cham. Panstr. de pec. Ven. Id. Ibid.*

I answer; The consequence is not only false, but *blasphemous*, for the favour of God, and the reasons for which that is preserved or dissolved, are not to be paralleld with the friendship of man, and the reasons for which this is either maintain'd or destroy'd. Nor are the Offices of man to man to be equaliz'd with the Duties of man to God, and so neither the offences. To make this plain, I argue,

1. From Popish Principles.

2. From undeniable Reason.

1. From Popish Principles. For,

1. Do they not constantly declare, That though a man, be he never so high, he neither doth nor should inflict great punishments upon his inferiors for light and small offences, yet that God inflicts grievous torments upon his Children for the least, even *Venial Sins*, even the torments of *Purgatory*, not less than those of Hell, but only in *duration*, (if you'l believe *Bellarmine*,) the least whereof (as *Aquinas* tells us,) is greater than the greatest in this life?

2. Do not the *Papists* grant that there are *many* kinds of offences which *do not* destroy Humane friendship (nor ought) which yet exclude *from Gods love?* As when a man out of a *good intention* of helping or benefiting his friend, proves *hurtful* or *offensive* to him; this excludes not a man from his friends favour; but when a man out of a zealous intention to please God, doth offend him (as *Paul* did who thought *he did God good service* in persecuting the Church), he doth with *Paul* in that case, sin *mortally*, and deserve exclusion from the favour of God.

2. I argue from undeniable reason: The sum whereof is this; *Man* offended by *man* hath causes to continue still his love to *man*, which *God* offended hath *not*.

1. Man by the bond of a *Precept*, is bound to forgive man; but God is not *capable* of such a *bond*.

2. Man offended, is a *finite* creature, and therefore offences against him, are comparatively *small* and *inconsiderable*; but offences against God are against an *infinite* Majesty, and therefore *infinite*.

3. Offences against Man are *mutual*, the *offended to day*, may be the *offendor to morrow*; but *God* never can *wrong* his Creature, no, though *he hurts it*; *What iniquity have your fathers found in me?* Jer. 2. 11.

4. Man offended may be, and perhaps hath been *benefited* by *the Man offending*, but to *God no good of ours can extend*.

5. A man offended, oft *warns not* the offendor that he should not offend or wrong him, but God hath *a thousand times admonisht, exhorted, intreated, threatned against offending of him*.

Second Concession.

2. I grant, though all Sins deserve eternal punishment, and though no Sins are Venial, yet that *all Sins are not equal, nor do they deserve equal punishment*. The Papists would willingly fasten this *Stoical dotage* upon us, of holding *the equality of Sin* (as did the *Jovinianists* of old) in requital for our maintaining the *damnableness of all Sin*; but what they

they say herein of us, is a meer slandering of us. This Calumny *Durus* in his Eighth Book against our famous *Whitaker* (*Quantum nomen!*) hath cast upon learned *Calvin*, That *he held all Sins were equal*, because *he held all were mortal*. The like also saith *Gautier* in his Chronological Table of the fourth Age, where speaking of the *Jovinianists* their making all Sins equal, he impudently tells us, *Calvins Doctrine is conformable to those who held all Sins equal, because it makes them all mortal*. But blessed *Calvin* both purgeth *himself* from the Calumny, and confutes the *argument* on which 'tis grounded, in the third Book of his *Institutions*, *cap.* 4, by this *invincible answer*; *Scio* (saith he) *quam iniquè Doctrinam nostram calumnientur*, &c. *I know how unjustly the Papists calumniate our Doctrine; they say, By our making all Sins mortal and damnable, we set up the Paradox of the Stoicks, of the equality of Sins; but* (saith he) *the very Doctrine of the Papists themselves will fully clear us; for I demand of them, Do they not acknowledg that among those Sins they call Mortal, there is an inequality, and that one Mortal Sin is greater than another, and therefore they cannot charge me with making all Sins equal, because I hold they are all Mortal*. How is then the Doctrine of *Equality* of Sins, more to be fathered upon *Calvin*, than upon the Papists themselves? 'Tis our constant Doctrine, That Sins and their punishments are *unequal*, though all Sins are *Mortal*. We teach, Though all Sins *deserve eternal punishment*, yet not the *same degree* of eternal punishment, but some a *lesser* degree than others. Though *all Sins* deserve a punishment *extensively infinite*, yet not *intensively equal*. We agree to that old expression of *a mitius ardent nonnulli*; the flames of Hell shall be less torturing to some, than to others; for some, it will be *more tolerable at the day of judgment than for others*; *some are beaten with more, others with fewer stripes*, Luk. 12. 47, 48. As among the *Jews* there were several degrees of capital punishment for several offences, so are there in Hell several degrees of punishment suted to the degrees of Sin. Of which truth the words of Christ, *Mat.* 5. 22, are a clear proof, which tell us of the punishment inflicted by the *Judgment*, which was the *Consessus singularum Civitatum*, the Assembly belonging to every City, consisting of three and twenty, by whom the punishment inflicted was (according to the best Writers) *killing with the Sword*. In the same Scripture next we read of the punishment inflicted by the *Council* or *Sanedrim* consisting of seventy Elders, for greater offences, which punishment was *Stoning*. And lastly, there is mentioned the punishment of Γέεννα πυρὸς call'd *Hell-fire*, which was by the old Idolaters exercised upon their *Infants*, who were sacrificed in the Valley of *Hinnom*: Christ by the similitude of these Earthly punishments which passed one another in sharpness & severity, setting forth the

In eo *Calvinus* peccata paria facit quòd omnia mortalia, & æternis digna supplicijs censuerit. *Durus. cont. Whitak. Lib.* 8. Non parum conformis est Doctrina *Calvini*, nolentis audire peccata venialia, sed omnia definientis mortalia. *Gaut. Tab. Chron. sec.* 4. Scio quàm iniquè Doctrinam hanc nostram Calumnientur. Dicunt enim paradoxum esse Stoicorum de peccatorum æqualitate. Sed suo ipsorum ore, nullo negotio convincentur. —— Quæro enim, annon inter ea ipsa peccata, quæ mortalia fatentur, aliud alio majus agnoscant? Non igitur protinus sequitur paria esse peccata, quæ simul mortalia sunt. *Calv. Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *sec.* 13.

Κρίσεως erat consessus 23, virûm singularum civitatum; summus autem ille Synedrion vocatur. Κρίσεως pœna usitatissima erat gladius. Cum autem supra lapidationem, nulla pœna in usu Judaico esset, quæsivit Christus aliunde nomen horrendi cruciatus, qui & gladium & lapidationem excederet; *scil.* Γέεννα ignis. *Grot. in loc.*

degrees

degrees of punishments, in the place of the damned. This will yet be clearer, if we duly consider the case to which Christ is speaking, concerning which we may thus understand Christ expressing himself: *Heretofore men have been deter'd from murdering others, because the Law commands that murtherers should be cut off by the sword; But I would have you take heed of anger, because that is to be punisht in the next world as severely as murder is punisht in this. But if any to his anger, shall add evil-speaking he shall be punisht with a greater punishment; as Stoning is a greater than that by the Sword. And if his evil-speaking be very grievous and hainous, he shall suffer more exquisite torments, such as those sustained who were burnt in the Valley of* Hinnom. See *Grotius* on the place. And hereby *Bellarmines* Cavil is answered, who to prove that *all Sins* are not Mortal, and deserving eternal punishment in Hell, argues thus; *Here are* (saith he) *two Temporal punishments less than that of Hell-fire; and because he is only guilty of Hell-fire who breaks out into such an* outragious anger *as to call his brother* fool, *therefore the other degrees of anger are* Venial Sins, *as being only threatned with* Temporal *punishments.* But this *erroneous Sophister* perverts the true sense of this Text, not considering that the true import thereof is this, That all the *three degrees* of anger here mentioned by our Saviour, are *totidem homicidia*, so many murders (as *Pareus* speaks) and that the three *degrees* of punishment expressed here, are three degrees *unius specie pœnæ* of one punishment in *kind and nature*, which is eternal punishment *in Hell*, and that a *less degree* of torment in Hell is understood by the *Judgment*, than by the word *Council*, and a less by *Council* than by *Hell-fire*, and that all the three degrees of punishment here expressed by Christ, *equally intend the punishment of the damned in Hell*, though not in equality of punishment to be inflicted on the offenders. Thus *Irenæus* of old interpreted this Text: *Not only* (saith he) *is he guilty of killing to damnation, who kills his brother, but even he who is angry with him without a cause.* So Saint *Austin de verb. Domini*, *Omnes cruciabuntur, sed minus ille, minus ille*; All shall be tormented, though some more, some less. Thus also *Barradius* and *Maldonat*, *Bellarmines* fellow-Jesuits, (though not greater *Sophisters*, yet better Expositors than *Bellarmine*) interpret this Text, ingenuously confessing, That by *Judgment* and *Council* as well as by *Hell-fire*, the *eternal death* of the Soul is to be understood, though with a gradual difference of the punishment.

Vid. *Grot.* in loc.

Tres iracundiæ species totidem facit homicidii species, & per hoc lethales omnes coram Deo, licet impariter. *Dav. Partus contr. Bellar. de amis. Grat. p.* 90, 91.

Non solum qui occidit, reus est occisionis ad damnationem, sed qui irascitur fratri suo causâ fratris suo. *Iren. l.* 2. *c.* 46.

Tres hi gradus supplicii pœnam significant Gehennalem. *Barrad. l.* 7. *c.* 17.

Per Concilium, capitalem pœnam intelligit, per civilem capitis pœnam, sempiternam animæ mortem intelligit. Christus & eum qui irascitur, & eum qui fratrem suum levem, & eum qui stultum appellat eadem inferni pœna, non eadem pœnæ gravitate dignum docet. *Maldon. in Mat.* 5. 22.

3. My third Concession is this, *Though no Sin be venial but every Sin deserves eternal death, yet no Sin of its own nature necessarily and infallibly damns, but the Sin against the Holy Ghost.* All other Sins may possibly be pardoned, *Mat.* 12. 31. every Sin that admits of Repentance, is pardonable. All Sins are *remissibile secluso finali impœnitentiæ respectu*, which are not followed with final impenitence; as is that against the *Holy Ghost*. Other Sins make a man *liable to death*, this *pertinaciously opposite to the terms of life*. This is *that Sin unto death* mentioned 1 *Joh.* 5. 16 17.

And

And hereby the argument of *Basly* the Jesuite for Venial Sin is obviated, who from this Scripture, which mentions a *Sin not unto death, and a sin that is unto death*; argues, that some Sins are of their *own nature venial*, and *not* deserving death, though other Sins are *mortal*, and *do* deserve death. 'Tis true St. *John* distinguisheth between a *Sin not unto death*, and a *Sin unto death*; but by both expressions he intends Sins *mortiferous in their own nature*, and such as *deserve* eternal death. By the *Sin not unto death*, he understands a Sin notwithstanding which, a man *may* avoid *eternal death*, and may be pardoned though it *deserves eternal death*; and by a *Sin unto death* he intends a Sin which whosoever commits, can *never be pardoned*, and therefore can *never* escape *eternal death*; and hence he would not have *such* a Sinner as commits it, *pray'd for*. And that by the *Sin not unto death* he doth not mean a *venial* Sin that *deserves not death*, is plain from this very Text, where the Apostle saith, *That life shall be given for them that have not sin'd unto death*, by the prayers of the faithful; but I desire to know why *life should be given for him that sins not unto death*, if his Sins were *venial* & did not at all *deserve death*. Certainly the Sin which the Apostle calls a *sin not unto death*, had meritoriously taken away the *life of the Soul*, and so cannot be accounted *venial*, but in some kind mortal; and 'tis as plain from the Text, that by *the Sin* which is *unto death*, the Apostle means not a Sin which is *mortal*, or only deserving death, as distinguisht from Venial Sin; because the Apostle forbids the *praying for him that commits that sin which is unto death*. Now if the Apostle forbids praying for him whose Sin is mortal, as only deserving death, then it would unavoidably follow that none should be *pray'd for* that commit *mortal Sins* or Sins deserving death, but only they who commit *Venial Sins*; which is contrary to Christs, both Precept and Example, who both commands us to pray for Persecuters, (and no Papist can deny that *Persecution* is a *Mortal Sin*,) and did himself, as also did after him that Blessed Martyr *Stephen* pray for his Persecuters. And so clearly true is this, that *Bartholomæus Petrus* a Papist, and Professor of *Douay*, in his Continuation of *Estius*'s Comment on the Epistles, on 1 *Joh.* 5. 16. ingenuously confesseth, That by a Sin *not unto death* is to be understood, a Sin from which a man may *arise by repentance*, and that by a *Sin unto death*, we are to understand a *Sin from which a man can never arise by repentance*. And that a Mortal Sin may be said to be *not unto death*, he illustrates by the speech of *Christ* concerning *Lazarus*'s Sickness. *This Sickness* (saith Christ) *is not unto death*; namely, because *Lazarus* was to be recall'd to life, and so a *Sin not unto death*, is a Sin from which, and from death by which, a man may be recall'd; as a Sin *unto* death is a Sin from which, and from death by which, a man cannot

Peccatum non ad mortem dicitur Apostolo, quod est mortale quidem sed agitur ejus pœnitentia. Videbitur hoc mirum alicui, quod peccatum quoddam mortale dicatur non ad mortem esse; sed meminisse debet quod salvator *Joan.* 11. dicebat, infirmitas hæc non est ad mortem, cum tamen *Lazarus* ex eâ infirmitate mortuus fuerit; sic in proposito peccatum mortale, cujus vera pœnitentia agitur, non est ad mortem. *Barth. Pet.* in 1 *Joh.* 5. 16.

be recall'd. Thus also *Lorinus* and *Justinian* both Jesuits expound this place of *John*; expresly and fully.

Comparatio hæc inter peccata aptius fit, intelligendo de peccato non veniali, sed mortali. *Lorin.* in *loc:* Peccatum non ad mortem, non potest peccatum significare veniale, cum enim dicat *Johannes*, Oranti pro peccato non ad mortem dandam esse vitam, plane indicat hoc peccatum non ad mortem, spiritualem vitam admere, quod si spirituali vitâ destituitur qui peccat non ad mortem, mortifero scelere obstringatur, necesse est. *Justin.* in *loc.*

The fourth Concession.

4. My fourth Concession is this; *Though no Sin be Venial in its own nature, and deserving of pardon, yet this hinders not but that Sin is Venial by an extrinsick cause, namely, the grace and mercy of God in Christ.* Though *Venial* Sins (as the Papists call them) in themselves are *Mortal*; yet *Mortal Sins through Grace are Venial.* All the Sins of the *Elect*, and of those in the *state* of *Grace*, are, though in themselves *damnable*, yet pardoned *through Grace*, and not *damning. There is no condemnation to them* (saith the Apostle) *that are in Christ Jesus.* Though the *least Sin* makes us *guilty* of damnation if God should deal with us *strictly*, and *secundum legis rigorem*, according to the rigour of the Law; yet the *greatest* cannot effect this *guiltiness* of damnation, where mercy through *Christ* is confer'd upon the most unworthy. Sins in *themselves* unworthy of pardon, are *Venial* to the *guilty*, *ex benignitate judicis*, by the goodness of the Judg, and remissible to the *debtor*, *ex liberalitate Creditoris*, by the bounty of the Creditor. Though *ex peccati natura*, every Sin excludes from Salvation; yet *ex misericordia Dei*, no Sin doth so. Though Sin be not exempted from desert of punishment, *quia vindicari non debet*; yet 'tis exempted, *quia Deus vindicare nolit.* Though not because it *ought* not to be punished; yet because God through Christ *will not* punish it.

Rom. 8. 1.

Venialia dicuntur peccata, ab Eventu, non quòd per se veniâ digna sunt. Sunt venialia reis ex benignitate judicis, remissibilia debitori ex creditoris liberalitate. *Rivet. Tr.* 4. *Q.* 13.

And hence, 1. It follows, that as all the Sins of Reprobates are deadly, not only *ex merito*, because of their *merit*; but also *ex eventu*, and in the *event*, because no Sin is *Venial* in it *self*, but only by Gods *mercy*: So likewise, 2. That the reason why the Sins of the *Regenerate* exclude them not from the favour of God, is not from their *own nature*, but meerly from Gods *mercy*, all Sins deserving that exclusion. Yea, 3. Hence it follows, that though *damnation* be actually inflicted upon *some* for their Sins, *viz. Unbelievers*; yet *remission* and *salvation* may be bestow'd upon *others*, notwithstanding they have committed those *very* Sins for which *others* are damned. To Unbelievers *Whoredom* is damning, and excludes them from *the Kingdom of God*, Ephes. 5. 5; and yet *Davids* Adultery excluded not him from that Kingdom. The murdering of *Christ* was imputed to *Judas* and *Pilate*; and yet not to those *Act.* 2. 23, 38. who *slew Christ with wicked hands*, whom *Peter* wills to *repent*, and be *baptized for the remission of sins.* God pardoned *Davids* Adultery with *Bathsheba*, but might not *Antonies* with *Cleopatra*; *Lots* Incest was,

was, *Herods* might not be forgiven. *Salomons* Idolatry was, and *Jeroboams* might not be remitted. Yea hence I ſtar not to aſſert, that *greater* Sins may be *pardon'd* to *ſome*, when *ſmaller* may *damn others*: An *idle word* may deſtroy *one*, when *Murder* and *Adultery* may not *another*.

And this fully anſwers *Bellarmines* Argument for the *Veniality* of Sin. 'Tis this, *If all Sins be Mortal of their own nature, and only Venial to Believers, becauſe of their Faith; then all Sins ſhould be Mortal to Unbelievers, and Venial to Believers;* But *this* (ſaith he) *is falſe, that all Sins of Unbelievers ſhould be Mortal, and all Sins of Believers Venial: for if they be Venial to Believers, then much more are they ſo to Unbelievers.* But why ſo, O Cardinal? Becauſe (ſaith he) the Sins of *Believers* are *more* grievous and *heinous* than the Sins of *Unbelievers*, as being committed againſt *more light and love*. Now this Argument is eaſily anſwer'd by my fourth Conceſſion. 'Tis *not* falſe that Sins though *ſmaller in genere peccati*, in the *kind* of Sin, ſhould be *Mortal* to *Unbelievers*, and greater Sins *Venial* to *Believers*; for as they are *Mortal* to *both* of their *own nature*, ſo by *accident*, through the mercy of God, pardoning to Believers both their ſmaller and greater Sins, their Sins become *Venial* in the *event*; which *accident* being deficient to Unbelievers in their ſinning, *Nequaquam eorum peccata facit venialia, ſed ut ſunt finit mortalia*; It makes not their Sins *Venial, but leaves them as they are in themſelves Mortal*, as learned *Pareus* in anſwer to *Bellarmine*. We grant (as *Gerard* expreſſeth it), that the *pardoned Sins* of *Believers* are *more* hainous than thoſe of *Unbelievers*; but hence it cannot be infer'd, that ſome Sins of *Unbelievers* are *Venial*: For that the Sins of *Believers* are *Venial*, 'tis not from the nature of their *Sins*, but from the meer *Grace* of God pardoning, and not imputing their Sins; and therefore to all *Unbelievers* their Sins remain ſuch as they are of their own nature, that is, *Mortal* or *Mortiferous*. This alſo ſtops the mouth of that deſperate or deſpairing Papiſt *Cotton*, who thus argues, to hold that all Sins deſerve *eternal puniſhment*, and that none can live without Sin, *is the ready way to drive men to the precipice of deſpair*, eſpecially when dying (he ſhould have ſaid; 'Tis the ready way to drive the Prieſts, thoſe ſilly Quacks, into deſpair of purging the Purſe with the pill of Purgatory): But the anſwer is eaſie, This Argument only becomes thoſe *quibus Dei miſericordia eſt ignota*, (as *Chamier* ſpeaks), who are ſtrangers to

Fideles graviùs peccantes, venialiter peccant; ergo multo magis venialiter peccant infideles, levius peccantes; ſic *Bellarminus*. Reſpondet *Pareus*. Antecedens falſum eſt intellectum per ſe, verum eſt ex accidenti, propter miſericordiam Dei veniâ delentis non levia tantum, ſed omnia peccata fidelium reſpiſcentium; quod accidens cum in peccatis infidelium deficiat, nequaquam ea venalia facit, ſed mortalia finit, ut ſunt ſuâ naturâ omnia eorum peccata. *Pareus contr. Bell. de amiſſ. Grat. c.* 11. Certum eſt renatos per peccata mortalia contra conſcientiam commiſſa, gravius Deum offendere quam infideles, quibus tantum cognitionis lumen, ac tantus beneficiorum divinorum cumulus non obtigit; ſed ex eo nondum inferri poteſt, quædam peccata infidelium eſſe ſuâ natura venialia; quòd enim in renatis quædam ſint venialia, id non eſt à naturâ peccatorum, ſed ex ſolâ Dei miſerentis, & peccata non imputantis gratiâ. Ergo in non-renatis & infidelibus, omnia omnino peccata ſunt & manent talia, qualia ſunt ex naturâ ſuâ, hoc eſt, mortalia. *Gerh. loc. Com. de pec. act. p.* 306.

the mercy of God in Christ, and will not trust to it for Salvation. 'Tis not the *smalness* of Sin, but the *greatness* of Christ, that saves us. This pitiful Papist draws a damnable *conclusion* from a *Divine* principle. The *principle is*, *No sin is Venial*; therefore (saith he) *despair*; but therefore say we, believe, go out to *Christ* for free remission through his blood, whereby all Sin *Mortal* in its nature, is *Venial* to the Believer. And let me tell thee (O thou blind Papist) though thou sinnest *much* in making Sin *small*, yet thou sinnest *more* in making my *Saviour* so. I shall conclude this fourth *Concession*, with manifesting the consent herein of the learnedest of the *Papists* with our Protestant Divines. *Aquinas* saith, *Eternity of punishment is due to every Sin of the unregenerate, ratione conditionis subjecti*, in respect of the state of him that commits *it, who wants that Grace whereby Sin is only remitted.* And *Cajetan* upon those words of *Aquinas*, tells us, that *Grace is the only fountain whence floweth remission of Sin, and nothing maketh Sin venial or remissible, but to be in Grace; and that nothing maketh Sin irremissible and not venial, but the being out of a state of Grace*; and that which maketh Sin *Venial or not Venial, is the state of the subject wherein 'tis found.* For if we respect the nature of Sin as 'tis in it self, it will remain (without grace) eternally in stain and guilt, and so will subject the Sinner to eternal punishment, and is mortal. So that *remissibility or irremissibility of Sins must not be considered according to the sins themselves, but according to the subjects being, or not being in the state of Grace.* *Fisher* Bishop of *Rochester*, though a most bitter adversary to *Luther*, yet concerning the *Veniality of Sin*, he thus speaks to *Luther*; *In this that Sin is Venial by the mercy of God, I am*, Luther, *wholly of thy mind.* *Azorius* confesseth, *That the remission of Venial Sin is of a free and supernatural benefit, and afforded to none that are not in a state of Grace.*

Peccato non debetur pœna æterna ratione suæ gravitatis, sed ratione conditionis subjecti, scilicet hominis, qui sine gratiâ invenitur, per quam solum fit remissio pœnæ. *Aquin. 1,2. Qu. 87. Art. 5. ad 1. p. mihi* 275.

Sola gratia est principium remissionis pœnæ. Remissibilitas, & irremissibilitas tam culpæ quàm pœnæ attenduntur penes statum subjecti, scil. esse in gratiâ vel non, statui gratiæ convenit remissibilitas positive, statui vero culpæ extra gratiam convenit irremissibilitas positive. *Cajet. in loc. prædict. p. mihi* 275. Quòd peccatum veniale solum ex misericordiâ Dei veniale sit, hoc ego tecum, *Luthere*, sentio. *Contra Luther. Art.* 32. Venialis remissio peccati, gratuitum & supernaturale est beneficium Dei, nemini extra gratiam Dei constituto peccatum veniale dimittitur. *Azor. l.* 4. *c.*10. Nisi quia est ab homine justo Dei gratia & charitate prædito commissum, perpetuo puniretur. *Azor. l.*3. *c.*9.

Thus far are our *Concessions* concerning the Veniality of Sin, or our granting what is not to be denied, which was the *first* part of my Explication; I come now to the *second Branch* of Explication, which is to be by way of *Negation*, or denial of what is not to be granted.

2d. *Branch of Explicat.*

That which I peremptorily *deny* is this, *That any Sins are exempted from deserving eternal punishment, upon the account of any imaginary, or imaginable smalness or levity of Sin.*

Agnoscimus quorundam deliria, qui, quod dicitur de alieno corio sunt liberales, stultitiam debitorum qui adversus creditorem suum, judicium proferunt in propriâ causâ. Certè reus qui coram judice suo culpam extenuat, cum res tota judici perspecta est, imprudenter valde se gerit, nec minus stultè facit, qui debitum suum vel negat, vel minuit apud eum qui convincere potest & cogere. *Rivet. Sum. contr. Tr. quæst. Quæst.* 13.

'Tis ingeniously exprest by Learned *Rivet* in his *Catholicus Orthodoxus*,

dexus, against *Baily* the Jesuite upon this occasion; *That there are some who de alieno corio sunt liberales, cut large thongs out of an Hide that's none of their own*, That (he means) of Gods mercy; who measure Gods *judgment* according to their own *rule*; and like *foolish debtors* will be judges of their own cause against their Creditor. *That guilty Malefactor* (saith he gravely) *is unwise, who extenuates his fault before his Judg, to whom his whole cause is known; nor is it less imprudent to diminish our Sins before that God, who can both convincere & cogere, convince us of our debts, and compel us to make Satisfaction. Bellarmine* then and his Complices are none of the wisest or honestest, who dictate to us, that some Sins are so *light and little*, that they deserve no eternal punishment, but are *Venial*; 1. Some *in genere suo*, in their kind of Sin, as when the Will is carried out to that, which contains in it self a *kind of inordination indeed, but yet such as is not contrary either to the love of God or our Neighbour, as an officious lie, or an idle word*; and that, 2. Some Sins are *Venial ex imperfectione operis*, by *the imperfection of the work*: and these (saith *Bellarmine*) are of two sorts; 1. Some are Venial *ex surreptione*, by their unexpected *stealth and creeping* into the Soul, and these are *sudden motions of lusts, anger, revenge, &c. which get into the mind before reason can deliberate, whether they are to be admitted or no*; and so they are not *perfecte voluntaria, have not the full consent of the Will.* 2. Other Sins are *Venial* by the *imperfection* of the matter, *ex parvitate materiæ*, which are *committed in a light and small matter*; as the *stealing of an half-peny*, which neither hurts our Neighbour, nor destroys Love. Against these we oppose, That *there's no Sin but deserves eternal punishment per propriam naturam & intrinsecam rationem*, by its own proper and intrinsecal nature. As the least drop of water is water, as truly as the whole Sea, so the least Sin is as truly Sin as the greatest; and the least Sin according to the *rigour of the Law* deserves an everlasting penalty. The imperfection of Sin as to *degree*, takes not away from it either the *reason* of Sin, or the *merit* of penalty, as *Medina, Azorius, Durand*, and others confess. *Azorius* tells us from *Durand, Vega, Cajetan*; That the Law of God *forbids Venial Sins, even all Sin both great and small*; and that the Arguments of the Protestants prove, that *Venial Sin* is against the Law of God. To which I add, that it implys a gross *contradiction*, to say that the *least* Sin should be said to be a *Sin*, and yet to be *Venial* and deserve pardon; for if it deserves *pardon*, then also *freedom* from *punishment*, and if *freedom* from *punishment*, then it hath no *guilt*, and if it have no *guilt*, then it is no *Sin*. Most true is that speech of *Altenstaig*, in his *Lexicon Theologicum*; *Nullum peccatum habet rationem ad merendam veniam, imo potius demeretur*; *Sin as Sin cannot deserve to be pardoned, but it deserves not to be pardoned.* Nor can *Bellarmine* with his Sophistry prove, that the *small* Sins before mention'd, are in their nature *Venial*: 'Tis little less than blasphemy what he dictates concerning a Sin Venial, *ex genere suo*, as an *idle word*, *an officious lie*, &c. that it

Vid. *Bellar.* l. 1. de amis. Grat. cap. 3.

Vid. *Medin.* in 1, 2. q. 88. a. 1. *Azor.* l. 4. c. 8. *Durand* q. 6. Dicendum est ut docuerunt *Durandus, Cajetanus & Vega*, veniale peccatum est quidem contra legem Dei, quia revera lex Dei prohibet & gravia & levia, id quod adversariorum argumenta comprobarunt. *Azor. Inst. Mor.* l. 4. c. 8. *Altenst.* Sub Tit. peccatum.

it is *not* againſt a *perfect* and a rigorous Law; that the Law which *forbids* it, is not perfectly a *Law*, and hath not perfectly *rationem legis*: But this is falſe (to ſay no worſe): For *that Law* truly binds the Conſcience to *perform it*, and therefore 'tis *truly a Law*; and that it truly binds the Conſcience, is clear, both becauſe it is *made by him* who hath *jus leges condendi*, *a right of making Laws*, and alſo becauſe it hath *a ſanction*, a threat, *viz.* the giving *an account*; and *condemnation* alſo, *Mat.* 12. 31. And when *Bellarmine* argues that Sins which he calls *venial ex ſurreptione*, by ſtealth into the Soul *unawares*, are not perfectly *voluntary*, and therefore are *venial*; 1. 'Tis acutely obſerved by the learned *Chamier*, *That a ſin may be by ſurreption, or inconſiderateneſs, and yet it may be voluntary alſo, ſurreption not being properly oppoſed to voluntarineſs, but to election, when upon weighing of circumſtances a thing is choſen; for it often falls out, that the will is carried to a thing, though by a ſudden and inconſiderate motion*, as Peter *deny'd Chriſt with his will, though ſuddenly, and inconſiderately, and yet thereby* Peter *committed a mortal ſin*: And though a Sin of *ſurreption* be not voluntary in the *higheſt degree*, yet is it with a true and proper conſent, (as *Ames* ſpeaks). 2. But beſides, the *nature* of Sin, its *formale* or that wherein it conſiſts, is not its *voluntarineſs, but its tranſgreſſion of the Law*. The *Law of* the *Creator*, not the *will of* the *creature*, is the Rule of right and wrong. *Voluntarineſs aggravates, but involuntarineſs excuſeth not Sin.* 3. 'Tis excellently obſerved by the learned *Davenant*, *That may be ſaid to be voluntary, not only which is committed with an expreſs and actual willingneſs, but that which is not hindred by the will when it is bound to hinder it; but the will is bound to command its reaſon, that it ſhould be wakeful and watchful, to ſuppreſs all the motions of inordinate concupiſcence.* 4. Further, doth not the Law prohibit and condemn all affections and motions, whether *deliberate* or by *ſurreption* and *indeliberate*? and hence it was, 5. That holy *Paul* complaining of the Sin that *dwelt in him*, Rom. 7. 19. was *afflicted*, not only for the *deliberate motions of ſin*, but alſo for thoſe that were *indeliberate* and *involuntary*; and would he have *mourned* under them, if they had not been *ſinful?* To conclude this, Doth not, ſixthly, the *ſurreption* and indeliberate *ſtealing* of depraved motions into the Soul, proceed *a pravitate damnabili*, from *a damnable and depraved principle* of nature? muſt it not then be ſinful and depraved alſo?

Surreptionem exiſtimamus opponi, non voluntati, ſed τῷ προαιρετικῷ, id eſt, electioni, cum omnibus cognitis, penſitatiſque circumſtantiis, unum eligitur denique; nam ſæpe accidit ut motu ſubitaneo, & inconſiderato voluntas ipſa ad aliquid feratur; ut voluntate *Petrus* negavit ſed ſubitaneâ, & peccavit tamen etiam mortaliter: Itaque & hæc quoq; quæ per ſurreptionem fiunt, voluntaria ſunt, ideoque & peccata, verè, inquam peccata. *Chamier l. 6. c. 10.*

Eſt voluntarium non quidem in ſummo gradu, ſed vero & proprio conſenſu, *Ames, Bellarm. Entrv. de pec. ven. pag. mihi* 16. Voluntarium reputatur, non modò quod expreſſâ & actuali voluntate committitur, ſed quod ab ipſa voluntate non impeditur, quando tenetur impedire. Tenetur autem voluntas imperare rationi, ut pervigil ſit in comprimendis omnibus inordinatæ concupiſcentiæ motibus. *Davenant* Q. 31. *Determ. p. mihi*, 145.

And when *Bellarmine* argues for the *Veniality* of Sin from the *parvitas materiæ*, the *ſmalneſs* and *ſlightneſs* of the *matter* in which Sin is committed, as the *ſtealing of an half-penny*, or a penny; I wiſh he had remembred, That

That according to this Doctrine, if *Bellarmine* ſhould ſteal a Peny from his poor Neighbour ten thouſand ſeveral times, he ſhould not yet after all, commit a Mortal Sin; ſince if the ſtealing of *one penny* be but a *venial* Sin, ten thouſand Venial Sins cannot make up or amount to one Mortal Sin. Beſides, the ſmalneſs of the matter in which a ſin is committed, is ſo far from extenuating, that it often aggravates the ſin committed; as 'tis a greater ſin to murder a man for Sixpence than for an hundred pounds, to deny my ſtarving Friend a peny-Loaf, than twenty Seam of Wheat; and thus Divines commonly aggravate *Adams* Sin by his breaking the Command of God in ſo ſmall a matter as was the *forbidden fruit*. And whereas *Bellarmine* tells us that the ſtealing of an half-peny or a peny is not *againſt the Law*, becauſe (ſaith he) *Lex non diſerte prohibet furtum oboli, The Law doth not expreſly mention any prohibition of ſtealing an half-peny or a peny*. What if I ſhould ask Cardinal *Robert*, whether the Law any where expreſly forbids the ſtealing of *a thouſand pounds*? and whether the ſtealing of ſuch a Sum is therefore *not againſt the Law*, becauſe the Law *expreſly* forbids it not? Doth not the *general* prohibition of *Theft* contain under it, all *the kinds of Theft*? Doth not this Command, *Thou ſhalt not ſteal*, forbid the ſtealing of *any thing* that is anothers, whether the thing be *great or ſmall*? even as the Law forbidding *Adultery*, forbids *that Sin with any* Woman, *noble or ignoble, rich or poor, bond or free*. In the overthrow of *Jericho* it was not expreſly forbidden to ſteal *a Babiloniſh Garment*, or two hundred Shekels of Silver, or a *Wedg of Gold*; and yet becauſe of the *general* prohibition *Achan* dyed for ſtealing that Garment, the two hundred Shekels of Silver, and the Wedg of God. Beſides, that which violates one *apex or tittle* of the Law, breaks the Law and offends God. How deeply holy *Auſtin* was humbled for ſtealing of an Apple, though ſtoln when he was a *Child*, appears by his Confeſſions. Surely in *Bellarmines* Divinity, *Adams* taking but an *Apple*, and that from his *Wife*, was but a Venial fault. In Military Diſcipline, a Souldier is hang'd for ſtealing of a Triſle, or of what is of a very inconſiderable value. The ſtealing of the *leaſt thing* is againſt a *great* both *Command and Commander*. And whereas *Bellarmine* argues, that the ſtealing of ſo ſmall a thing as an *half-peny, hurts not* our Neighbour, and therefore 'tis Venial and not *forbidden*; 'Its anſwered, the Law forbids not only the *hurting* of our Neighbour, in forbidding to *Steal*, but it forbids the *violation of Juſtice too*. The Law forbids *inward luſt*, but how doth *inward luſt* hurt our Neighbour? God in his Commands reſpects his own *purity* as well as our Neighbours *utility*. Further, 'tis evident that the *veniality* of a Sin committed againſt our Neighbour, cannot be gathered from its not *hurting* him *; for in many Caſes even *Bellarmine* will grant that a ſin againſt our Neighbour is *damnable*, though it hurt not our Neighbour at all, yea though it prove very *profitable and advantageous* to him. Take an inſtance in this true Story. A worthy Phyſician, ſome years ſince, had

Vid. *Paruum Molinæum in Thomæ Sdæ-nenſibus.*

Joſh. 6. 19. 7. 21.

* Joſephs Brethren ſinned mortally in ſelling their Brother, though by that ſelling him, he was highly advanced.

had a female Patient under Cure, to whom her leud Husband first gave the Foul Disease; and soon after, he gave her also a draught of rank Poison to kill her; but the Poyson meeting with the Distemper, by its violent operation overcame the Disease, and cured the Woman: According to *Bellarmines* Divinity, he should not, by giving her the poyson, have sinned mortally, because he was not only, by his murtherous endeavours, not hurtful, but very beneficial to his Wife. Still I follow *Bellarmine*, urging this Argument, That the stealing so small a thing *opposeth not Charity to man, or Love to God*. I answer, though a small Theft do not *expectorare* or *expugnare charitatem* (as Doctor *Davenant* expresseth it) destroys not Love & Charity, yet it doth *pugnare cum illa perfecta charitate*, oppose that perfect Love and Charity which the Law requireth; and it ariseth from that *inordinate lust* which the Law forbids, and which is contrary both to the *Law* and *Love* which the Law requireth. I add herein lyes the *great* mistake of *Bellarmine* in this point; in that he judgeth of the nature of mortal Sin by the *extinction of charity*, whereas it consists in any *swerving* or *declination* from the Law of God, and Charity. And when *Bellarmine* argues, That *præcepta de minimis non sunt proprie præcepta*; *Commands concerning the least things, are not properly Commands*: Besides that full answer I have formerly given, as to proving those Commands are most truly Commands, I cannot but here subjoyn that smart Expression of *Gerard*, who tells *Bellarmine*, thus arguing, *Satan himself was deficient in this Piece of* Bellarmines *Sophistry*; *and that Satan could not more speciously have covered his temptation to the eating the forbidden Fruit, than by saying, Tush, this is but a little Command, about a Trifle, an Apple, and indeed 'tis properly no Command at all.* And truly I should say, That *Bellarmine* might have *taught Satan* in this point, were it not that I look upon him in this, and in the greatest part of his Polemicks as taught, even to an *high* degree of proficiency, by that *School-Master*, both of *himself* and his *blackest Society*, I mean that of the Jesuits. As wild and weak is that Argument which *Bellarmine* grounds on that of *Luk.* 12. 59. *Thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the last mite.* Lo, here (saith *Bellarmine*) the last mite can intend nothing but some *small, venial sin* to be expiated in the Prison of *Purgatory*. But this bold Sophister perverts this Text, and plays too *saucily* with a most serious and *severe* Scripture. For by the *last mite* or farthing we must not understand *sins*, but the *punishments due* to sins, and the *minutissimas partes pœnarum*, the smallest parts of punishment in Hell. Thus the learnedst of, even Popish Expositors, expound that place; As *Brugensis* and *Jansenius*, who

Vid. *Thes. Sedan. ad. de pec. ven.* Neque illud recte dicitur, hujusmodi peccata non pugnare cum charitate: Revera non expectorant, aut expugnant charitatem hominis renati; Sed pugnant tamen cum illâ perfectâ charitate, quam Lex imperat, & oriuntur ab illâ inordinata concupiscentiâ quæ est charitati, & legi divinæ contraria. *Davenant. ubi supr.*

In eo labuntur adversarii quod peccati naturam mortiferam ex sola extinctione charitatis dijudicant, cum illa in qualibet declinatione a charitate & lege divina se exerat. *Id. ibid.* Gerard loc. Com. *c.* 19. de pec. Serpentina diaboli primævos homines decipientis calliditas,

non poterat speciosiori schemate pingi atque velari, quàm quòd primordialis illa lex de non comedendo arboris vetitæ fructu, sit præceptum, de re minima ac proinde non perfectè, & in rigore præceptum, cujus transgressio magnopere a Deo curetur. *Ger. de pec. Act. c.* 19. *prope fin.* Ei qui non dederit operam ut redeat in gratiam cum læso a se fratre, contingit, ut carceri inferni traditus, sine aliquâ debiti remissione exactum jus experiatur. *Jansen.* in *Mat.* 5. 26. Sensus est, summo tecum jure agetur, non liberaberis donec pœnas lueris extremas, tantas quantas exiget extremus justitiæ rigor. *Brugens.* in *Mat.* 5. 26.

make,

make, and that truly, the meaning thereof to be this, *Thou shalt in the suffering of eternal punishment, pœnas luere extremas, quantas exhibet extremæ justitiæ rigor; Thou shalt undergo the extremity and rigor of punishment from justice*: So that the *Prison* there mentioned, *v.* 58. is not meant of *Purgatory*, but of *Hell* (as *Tertullian* expressly saith) and *utter darkness* (as *Augustine*) and the payment of the *last mite* or farthing (as *Augustine* expounds it) imports as much, as *nihil relinquetur impunitum*; *No part of the punishment shall be abated*, but the wicked shall be there punished (as he expresseth it) *usque ad fœcem*, to the drinking the last drop and dregs of the Cup of Gods wrath. 'Tis but a wretched shift of *Bellarmine*, when he tells us that his *venial* or lesser sins, are not *contra*, but only *præter legem*, not against, but only *besides* the Law; by which distinction, this blasphemous Sophister not only falls foul upon *Andrew de Vega*, and other Papists, (whom he very roundly reproves for granting that *venial sins* are properly *against the* Law, telling them, That *upon that Principle, they can never maintain the possibility of a perfect impletion of the Law*, because (as he saith) they can never get off cleverly from that Scripture (*he that offends in one is guilty of all*); but which is worse, he audaciously wounds the purity and *perfection* of the Divine Law, to shelter his *venial* sins. Further (as that learned *Baronius* observes) were these *venial* small sins of *Bellarmine* only *besides*, and not *against* the Law, we ought not to call them *sins*, but *indifferent actions*, and so account them *lawful*; for that which is forbidden by no Law is *lawful*. And further, if this Doctrine were true, he that abstains from Venial sins, should do a work not of *precept*, but of *counsel* only, and so of *supererogation*, the Papists teaching that every good work not commanded by God, is a work of supererogation: But how absurd would this be to say, That by abstaining from a sin, a man doth a work of supererogation. I shall only add that Censure past upon *Bellarmine* by *Doctor Featly*, who saith, That here *Bellarmine* for saying some Sins are not against but only *besides* the Law, may well be accounted to be *besides himself*. And as for *Cotton* that proud Papist, who tells us there *is no proportion between eternal death and an idle word*, and therefore an *idle word is not to be so severely punisht*: I answer, That as the great and righteous Judg of Sin and Sinners, is fitter to judg of the proportion between the *least Sin* and *eternal punishment*, than any weak and guilty Malefactor; So, the will of God forbidding any Sin under an eternal penalty, is a sufficient reason of that penalty, and makes the punishment proportionable to the demerit of the Sin. I shall only chastise the intolerable insolence of this Popeling by asking him one question, and 'tis but this, *What proportion is there between eternal death, and the eating a morsel of Flesh in Lent, or a Womans spinning a Yard of Thread on an holy day.* If you Papists forbid these under pain of damnation (as you do), and that meerly because the *Church* appoints it so, ye blind Hypocrites, may not *divine prohibition* be allowed to make a proportion between a Sin, and eternal punishment,

Serm. Dom. in Mont. l. 1. c. 14.

L. 4. de justif. c. 14.

Jam. 2. 10. Videndum est illis quid respondeant Apostolo *Jacobo*, dicenti quicunque totam legem Servaveriat, offendat autem in uno, factus est omnium reus. *Bellar. de justif.* l. 4. c. 14. *Baron.* de pec: ven. p. 98.

Non afferamus ſtateras doloſas, ubi appendamus quod volumus, & quomodo volumus pro arbitrio noſtro, dicentes, hoc grave, hoc leve eſt, ſed afferamus divinam ſtateram de Scripturis ſanctis, & in illâ appendamus peccata vel potius à Domino appenſa recognoſcamus. *Conf. Donat. 2. 6.*

niſhment, as well as that which is *Humane*, yea *Diabolical*; in the latter of which expreſſions I am not too ſevere, as long as we hold, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. to be *Canonical*. The ſum of all is but this; The *ſmalneſs* of Sin alters not the nature thereof. Its nature ſtands in this, that 'tis *againſt the Law:* If it be *not* prohibited, 'tis *no* Sin; If it be, 'tis *damnable* be it greater or ſmaller. I conclude this whole firſt part of my Diſcourſe, its Explicatory part, with that holy and excellent advice of St. *Auſtin*, *Lib. 2. contr. Donatum. Non afferamus ſtateras doloſas*, &c. *Let us not bring deceitful Ballances to weigh in them what we will, and how we will according to our own pleaſure, ſaying, this is heavy, this is light; but let us fetch a Divine Ballance out of the holy Scriptures, and in them let us weigh our Sins, or rather let us judg of them as they are there weighed.*

I have ſaid what I intended as to the *Explication* of this great Truth, the denial of Venial Sin, both as to *Conceſſion* and *Negation*; I proceed now to the *ſecond Branch* of my Diſcourſe about this Point, and that is the *Confirmation* of it.

And my firſt, and more immediately Scriptural Argument ſhall be this:

2*d. Part.*

Arg. 1. No Fault is Venial in it ſelf, that deſerves eternal death:
But every Sin deſerves eternal death:
Therefore no Sin in it ſelf is Venial.

The *firſt* Propoſition or *major* is granted by the Papiſts, who tell us that the *nature* of Sins *Veniality*, ſtands in its *not* deſerving eternal death; and therefore no Sin is Venial that deſerves eternal death.

The *minor* or *ſecond* Propoſition, *viz.* that *every Sin deſerves eternal death*, I ſhall clearly prove by Scriptures and reaſon.

1. By *Scriptures*; and I ſhall name three. The *firſt* is that which I named for my Text, *Rom.* 6. 23. *The wages of Sin is death.* The *ſecond* is, *Ezek.* 18. 4. *The ſoul that ſinneth ſhall die.* The *third* is that of *Deut.* 27. 26. *Curſed be he that continues not in all the words of this Law*, &c. To theſe Scriptures *Bellarmine* anſwers, but very miſerably.

To that of *Rom.* 6. 23. *The wages of Sin is death*; *Bellarmine* anſwers, That when *Paul* ſaith, *The wages of Sin is death*; 'tis *only meant of Mortal Sin*, and thus is he to be underſtood, *The wages of Mortal Sin is death.* But I anſwer, with as good reaſon, in all the places of Scripture, wherein we are dehorted from Sin, he may caſt this *ſhameful* gloſs upon them, and ſay, that we are in them, dehorted not from *all* 1 Pet. 3. 11. *Sin*, but only from *Mortal Sin*; as when the Scripture ſaith, *eſchew evil*; *Bellarmine* may add this gloſs, and ſay, we are not forbidden to ſhun *all* 1 Theſ. 5. 22. *evil*, but only *Mortal* evil. And ſo when *Paul* ſaith, *abſtain from all appearance of evil*; that is, as *Bellarmine* expounds it, abſtain from all ap- Rom. 12. 9. pearance of Mortal evil; and *Rom.* 12. 9. *abhor that which is evil*; *i.e.* Mortal evil; yea when we pray to be *deliver'd from evil*, that with *Bellarmines* comment, is only Mortal evil, *not all ſin.* But further I would

ask

ask any Papiſt, only theſe two eaſie queſtions, 1. What is the meaning of theſe words, *Rom.*6.23. [*The wages of ſin is death?*] The Papiſt will anſwer, by theſe words, the Apoſtle means [that *Sin deſerves death.*] Let *Benedict Juſtinian* the Jeſuit upon *Rom.*6.23. ſpeak for all, who gives it thus, *by the deſert of ſin, eternal puniſhments are inflicted.* 2. I demand, What is the meaning of this word [*mortal*] when *Bellarmine* thus expounds this Text, the *wages of* [*mortal*] *Sin is death?* All the Papiſts with *Bellarmine* readily anſwer, that the meaning of a *mortal* Sin, is a *Sin that deſerves death.* Now, Reader, be pleas'd to add to the Apoſtles Propoſition *the wages of ſin is death*, that is, *Sin deſerves death*, *Bellarmines* Expoſition, *the wages of* [*mortal*] *Sin is death*; That is, of a *Sin that deſerves death*, and *Pauls* Propoſition will be turn'd into a groſs *Tautology*, and be made to ſpeak thus, *Sin deſerveth death that deſerveth death*; a wretched depravation of the ſacred Text, whereby they ſhew that rather than they will renounce a groſs error, they will make the divinely-inſpired Apoſtle, to ſpeak groſs non-ſenſe. Beſides, 'tis evident that in this ſixth Chapter to the *Romans*, the Apoſtle dehorts the converted *Romans* from all Sin; particularly, *v.*2. *God forbid that we ſhould continue in ſin; and how ſhall we live any longer therein.* Now will any dare ſo wretchedly to interpret *Paul*, as to ſay that the Chriſtians are here dehorted only from *ſome* Sins, and not from all? If any would offer ſo to expound the Apoſtle, I would inſtantly ſtop his mouth by two Arguments taken from the Context, wherein the Apoſtle diſſwades from Sin *v.*3: 1. By a reaſon taken from being *baptized into the death of Chriſt*, now when we are ſo baptized, is not *all* Sin waſht away and deſtroyed? And 2. the Apoſtle uſeth another reaſon to diſſwade from continuing in Sin, and that is, the conſideration of their *former yielding* themſelves to Sin; Whence he argues, They ought now as much to ſerve *Righteouſneſs* as formerly they had ſerved *Sin*, *v.*19; whence 'twill follow, That as they had formerly ſerved not only greater but ſmaller Sins, ſo now they ought to caſt off the latter as well as the former, even all Sin whatſoever. Now if *Paul* by theſe two Arguments dehorts from *all Sin*, why ſhould he not then do ſo by this next Argument, *viz.* the *iſſue of Sin*, the *wages of Sin is death?*

Sempiterni cruciatus peccati merito redduntur. *Bened. Juſt. in* Rom.6. *p.*191.

As to that place of *Ezek.* 18.4. *The ſoul that ſinneth, it ſhall die*; *Bellarmine* anſwers, The Prophet only intends that threat againſt *Mortal Sins*, grievous and hainous abominations, not againſt *ſmaller Sins* which he calls *Venial.* But he abuſeth the Scripture, for the Prophet there ſetting down the *ſtanding rule* of Divine Juſtice, that none ſhould die but for *his own Sins*, makes no exception of *leſſer Sins* from being within the compaſs of that *Commination*, not ſaying the Soul that *grievouſly* ſins, but the Soul that *ſins*, ſhall die. *Univerſe dictum eſt*, 'tis univerſally expreſt as *Pareus* notes; but to put all out of doubt, that *leſſer* as well as *greater ſins*, are threatned to be puniſht with death by the Prophet, 'tis plain from the 31. *verſ.* of that Chapter, where the Prophet

plainly declares his meaning to be of Sin in *general* without any *restriction*; *Cast away from you* (saith he) *ALL your transgressions, and make you a new heart, for why will ye die?* All Sins therefore which opposed a *new heart*, are they commanded to cast away, and are here clearly discovered to be deadly.

To that place of *Deut.* 27. 26. *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them*; *Bellarmine* still gives the old answer: By the *words of this Law* (saith he) are not meant the words of the *whole Law*; as if God had threatned a curse against *all Sins* in general, but only of *Mortal Sins*, some *grosser Sins of Murder, Incest, Idolatry, &c.* But this is a *cursed* gloss put upon a Divine *curse*; for the words here used, *the words of this Law*, are the same with those of Verse the 8th. where the very same expression *the words of this Law*, intend the words of the *whole Law*; and evident it is that here all those Sins are intended which are opposed to *Legal Righteousness*, *Do this and live*; but such are all Sins in general. But the Apostle whom I ever took for a *better Expositor* of Scripture than either *Bellarmine* or the *Pope*, leaves no place for dispute in this matter, who *Gal.* 3. 10. citing this very place of *Deuteronomy*, denounceth the Curse, not against those that commit *some gross Sins* against *some* part of the Law, but against those that *continue not in all things that are written in the book of the Law*; *i.e.* those that commit any Sin whatever.

Thus I have made good by *Scripture* this Proposition, *viz. Every Sin deserves eternal death.* I shall now proceed to prove it by two *Reasons*; the first whereof is this:

Every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death;
Every Sin is a Transgression of the Law:
Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *second* Proposition, or *minor*, That every *Sin is the transgression of the Law*, is contain'd in the express words of Scripture, 1 *Joh.* 3. 4. where Sin is call'd *the transgression of the Law*, from which every Sin is a swerving, and thence hath its both nature and name also; and 'tis granted by the learnedst among the Papists, that all Sins, even Venial are *against the Law*; so *Durand*, *Gerson*, *Vega*, *Azorius*, *Cajetan*, with others. And *Augustin's* old definition of Sin, that 'tis *dictum, factum concupitum contra legem*; that *Sin is that which is either said, done*, or *desir'd against the Law*, falls in with them, or rather they with it; and therefore *Bellarmines* distinction of some *Sins* that are only *præter*, *beside*, and not *contra*, *against* the Law is grosly false; for if *all* Sins are *forbidden* by, all Sins are *contrary* to, the Law.

The *major* or *first* Proposition, That every *transgression* of the Law deserves eternal death, is most certain: But I prove it thus.

Whatever deserves *the Curse of the Law*, deserves eternal death; but every Transgression of the Law deserves *the Curse of the Law*: Therefore every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death.

The

The *major* or first Proposition cannot be deny'd unless we will hold that the Curse of the Law, only contains *temporal* evils, which is horridly false; for if that were true, then Christ hath not delivered us from eternal death by *delivering* us from the *Curse of the Law.*

The *minor* or second Proposition, That every *Transgression of the Law* deserves *the Curse of the Law*, I prove from that clear and full Scripture, *Gal.* 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continues not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* According to the rigor of the Law, the least breach thereof makes us cursed, and this was the Laws unsupportable burden, that when we were bound to do *all* things in the Law, and were unable to do them, we were yet cursed for not doing them.

2. My *second* reason to prove that *every* Sin deserves eternal death is this;

That which deserves an *infinite* punishment deserves eternal death; but every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment: Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *major* or first Proposition is deny'd by none, there being no infinity of punishment mention'd, or imagin'd, but in that call'd in Scripture *eternal death.*

The minor or second Proposition, that every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment, I thus prove:

If *Christ* laid down an infinite price to *redeem us from every Sin*, then every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment; but *Christ* laid down an infinite price to redeem us from every Sin:

Therefore every Sin deserves an infinite punishment.

The consequence is evident, That if *Christ* laid down an infinite price for every Sin, then every Sin deserves an infinite punishment, because it had been an unjust exacting of punishment upon Christ, had there been required of him the laying down of an *infinite price* for a *finite evil*, that required only a finite punishment to be inflicted for it.

The minor or second Proposition, *viz.* That *Christ* laid down an *infinite price* to redeem us *from every Sin*, is undeniable by those that will neither deny Scriptures nor Catechisms: For that *Christ* redeem'd us by an *infinite price*, hath not only the consent, but 'tis the ground of the comfort of all Christians. *Infinitas personæ facit infinitatem pretii*, an Infinite person made the price of infinite value. And that *Christ* laid down this *infinite* price for *all* Sins, is with the like consent and comfort embraced by all that believe the Scriptures aright, which abound in Texts that express it, *Psal.* 130. *ult. He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities.* 1 Joh. 1. 7. *The blood of Christ cleanseth from all Sin.* Tit. 2. 14. *He gave himself that he might redeem us from all iniquity.* Hence *Hos.* 14. 2. 'twas a prayer of Faith, *Take away all iniquity*; and *Isa.* 53. 10. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all*; and *Joh.* 1. 19. *The Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the World*; and *Mat.* 1. 21.

1. 21. *He ſhall ſave his people from their ſins*; from every Sin, and every Sin perfectly.

2d. *Arg.* My ſecond Argument to prove that no Sin is venial, is this:

Whatſoever is contrary to the loving of God *with the whole heart*, is not Venial but Mortiferous;

But every Sin is contrary to the loving of God *with our whole heart*:

Therefore every Sin is Mortal, and ſo not Venial.

The *firſt* Propoſition or *major* is undeniable; becauſe he that loves not God with *his whole heart*, *ſins* againſt the expreſs words of the command, *Mat.* 22. 37. And the *loving God with all the heart*, is call'd *the great command*, and is prefer'd before the *love of our neighbour by Chriſt*, *Mat.* 22. 38, 39. Since therefore there are many commands of love to *our neighbour*, which cannot be violated but we muſt needs Sin mortally (as the Papiſts grant), 'twill evidently follow, That a tranſgreſſion of the command of loving God with *all the heart*, muſt needs be a Mortal Sin.

The *ſecond* Propoſition or *minor*, That *every Sin* oppoſeth the loving of God *with all the heart*, and that whoever ſins, loves not God with *all the heart*, is as true as the former.

Bellarmine therefore dares not here anſwer by denying this truth abſolutely; but by a lame and lamentable diſtinction, he anſwers here, That to love God *with all the heart*, may be taken two ways:

Non Prælatione. 1. To love God ſo intirely and perfectly as that nothing is *prefer'd before* Gods love; and this love of God (ſaith *Bellarmine*) is both the meaning of the command, and ſuch alone alſo which Venial Sins do not oppoſe.

Non Admiſſione. 2. To love God ſo perfectly as that a man is ſo *wholly* taken up with the love of God, that no ſinful and vicious thought at any time can creep or ſteal into a perſons heart: But (ſaith *Bellarmine*) ſuch a love of God as *this*, is not commanded in this life, and this love of God he confeſſeth is oppos'd by Venial Sins. For anſwer to this impious diſtinction of *Bellarmine*, 'tis both moſt *falſe* and *frivolous*.

1. As he tells us that 'tis not neceſſary to the love of God with all the ſoul, that all vicious thoughts be hindred from *admiſſion* into a man; for this is clearly oppos'd not only by St. *Auſtin* of old, but by others, even Papiſts of late. St. *Auſtin* tells us, That *to love God with all the Soul, is to confer all the life, thoughts and underſtanding upon him, from whom we have them all, and to ſuffer no part of the life to give way to be willing to enjoy any thing elſe, but whatſoever elſe comes into the mind to be*

Diliges Deum ex toto corde, & ex totâ animâ, & ex totâ mente; *i.e.* omnes cogitationes, omnem vitam, & omnem intellectum in illum conferas, à quo habes ea ipſa quæ conferis. Quum autem ait toto corde, totâ animâ, tota mente, nullam vitæ noſtræ partem reliquit, quæ vacare debet, & quaſi locum dare, ut aliâ re velit frui; ſed quicquid aliud diligendum venerit in animum, illuc rapiatur quo totius dilectionis impetus currit. *Auguſt. Lib. 1. de Doctr. Chriſt. cap.* 22.

loved

loved, is to be carried thither. *Victor* expresseth it thus; *A man should burn with so hot a love to God, that nothing should creep into any faculty of the Soul, that either diminisheth love to God, or carrieth it any whither else.* *Anselm* excellently thus, on *Mat.* 22. *In the Understanding no place is to be left for Error; in the Will nothing is to be willed contrary to God, in the whole memory nothing is to be remembred whereby we may the less think of him.* *Aquinas* thus also; *A man must so love God, if with all the heart, as to subject himself to him,* and follow the rule of his *Commandments in all things; for whatsoever is contrary to his Law, is contrary to his Love.*

Hominem tanto Dei amore flagrare debere commonstrat, ut nihil prorsus in ullam animæ facultatem irrepere sinat quod suam erga Deum dilectionem diminuat aut alio transferat. *Vict.* in *Mar.* 12. In intellectu nullam relinquas errori locum. In voluntate nihil velis illi contrarium, in memoria tua nihil reminiscens quo minus de illo sentias. *Anselm* in *Mat.* 22. Est de ratione charitatis, quòd homo sic diligat Deum, ut velit se in omnibus ei subjicere, & regulam præceptorum ejus in omnibus sequi, quicquid enim contrariatur præceptis ejus, contrariatur charitati. *Thom.* 2da. 2dæ. Q. 24. *Art.* 12.

VIII.

Alvarez expresly opposeth *Bellarmine* in these words; *To love God is to admit nothing into the heart contrary to God.* *Theophylact* most fully; *To love God with all the heart is to cleave to him with all the parts and faculties of the Soul; to give our selves wholly to God, and to subject the nutritive, sensitive, and rational faculty to his love.* Now according to these Explications of the Love of God, the *least Sins* (which Papists call *Venial*) are contrary to it; for in them there's not *a pleasing of God in all* things, not a *forsaking of all things contrary to his will*; yea in these Venial Sins there's an *admission of a contrary* and unlawful *Love* of the Creature into the heart, and not a total *subjecting* thereof to God.

Diligere Deum est nihil in corde divinæ dilectioni contrarium admittere. *Alvarez* *Lib. 6. de Aut. div. Grat. disp.* 51. *Sec.* 4.

Ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Θεὸν ὁλοψύχως, τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ διὰ παντῶν μὲν τῶν ψυχῆς μερῶν καὶ δυνάμεων ἀυτῆς ὅλως ἑαυτὸν ὁρμῶμεν δίδοναι τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ὑποτάττειν, καὶ τὴν θρεπτικὴν, καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν, καὶ διανοητικὴν ἡμῶν δύναμιν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Theophil. in Mat. 22.

But secondly, in every Venial Sin, there's the *preferring* of something *before* God, and therefore a manifest *transgressing* of the Law of loving God. As to a *formal* and *explicite* preferring the Creature before God, so as to account the Creature a more excellent Good than God is, this all those do not, that live in the grossest and most *mortal* wickednesses, (as the Papists acknowledg); for men may live even in the hainous Sin of Persecution, and yet think thereby they serve and set up God: But as to a *virtual* and *interpretative* preferring the Creature before God, this men do in the least Sin; they *carrying* themselves so, as if the Creature were to be prefer'd before God, they fearing not for the love of the Creature to offend God, and injuriously to his Justice, to break his Commandments. And how may a man be said to shew by his *carriage*, more respect to the Creature than to God, if not by breaking the *Commands* of God and *contemning his will* for the Creature. To shun the dint of this Answer, the Papists are forced to this wretched shift, which

is

is to answer; That he who sins Venially, prefers not the Creature before God, because he knows that Venial Sins will not dissolve that knot of love and friendship between God and him. But what a pittiful excuse is this for Venial Sin, since (as *Baronius* well observes, *pag.* 106. *de pec. ven.*) They who commit Venial Sins, thinking these Sins will not dissolve the favour of God, either think such Sins are so light and slight that they *deserve* not the dissolution of Gods favour; or they think though they do deserve that dissolution, yet that God will *deal so graciously* with them, as that for such Sins, he will not exclude them from his favour: If they think that they do not *deserve* the dissolution of Gods favour, they grosly err, yea *grievously sin* against God, by judging their Sins to be light and little, and by a bold fixing of limits to Gods Justice; as if God could not justly punish their Sins with that penalty which he tells us they deserve: But if they think that their Sins do deserve the dissolving of Gods favour, and that it is meerly from the Grace of God that they who commit them, are not excluded from it; then it follows, That they for the love of the Creature offending God by these Sins, prefer the Creature before God and his favour; for whosoever for any Creature, dares do that which may justly exclude him from Gods favour, doth prefer the Creature before the favour of God: Nor doth their knowledg that these Sins do not exclude them from the favour of God, when yet they will commit them, extenuate or excuse their contempt of Gods favour, of which they are guilty, but contrarily it aggravates that contempt: since though they know, 'tis by Gods Grace and favour that their smaller Sins do not exclude them from his Love and Mercy, yet they abuse the Clemency and Goodness of God to a licentiousness in Sin, which is almost the highest contempt of Divine favour imaginable.

Arg. 3. My third Argument to prove, That no Sin is Venial, or deserving to be pardon'd, shall be drawn from the *nature of pardon*; whence I thus argue.

An opinion that overthrows the *nature* of Gods *pardoning* of Sin, is impious and erroneous; But this opinion that some Sins are Venial and deserve to be pardoned, doth thus *overthrow* the nature of *Gods pardoning of Sin:*

Therefore this opinion is impious and erroneous.

The *major* or *first* Proposition is evident.

The *minor* or *second* Proposition I prove thus: If pardoning of Sin designs an act of *free Grace* and favour, in pardoning, which God according to *strict justice*, might *not have done*; and if the Doctrine of Sins *Veniality* and deserving to be pardoned, makes pardoning an *act of justice*, so that God cannot but in justice do it, then the opinion of Sins *Veniality* overthrows the Doctrine of Divine pardon;

But the pardoning of Sin designs an act of *free Grace and favour*, which God *might not have* done unless he had pleas'd, and the Doctrine of

Sins *Veniality* makes the pardoning of Sin an act of *Justice* which God *cannot but do*; therefore the Popish Doctrine of *Venial Sin* overthrows the Doctrine of Divine pardon.

The *Major* or *first* Proposition is evident, and will be granted by all.

The *Minor* or *second* I prove thus in both its parts. As to its first part, 'tis most manifest that pardon designs an act of *free Grace and favour*; 'tis needless to multiply Scriptures (which to do were most easie) in so clear a point; *Ephes.* 1. 7. *Forgiveness of sin according to his grace.* *Psal.* 51. 1. *According to thy mercy blot out my transgressions.* 1 *Tim.* 1. 13. *I obtained mercy,* (saith *pardoned Paul.*)

Misericordia donatus sum. *Beza.*

For the second part of the *Minor*, that the Doctrine of the Papists about the *Veniality* of Sin, makes the pardoning of Sin an *act of justice*, which God *cannot but do* if he will do justly, is no slander cast upon the Papists in this Point. I pray let them be judg'd in this case, by their own confessions. The Council of *Mentz* professeth (as we heard) *That they cannot understand how God should be just if he punish any for Venial Sins with eternal punishment.* *Sonnius*, the Papist I mean, tells us that Venial Sin is *Venia dignum*, Venial Sin is worthy of pardon. And *Bellarmine*, That they *hold with a general consent, that Venial Sins make not a man guilty of eternal death*; and he asserts with intolerable blasphemy, *That God should be unjust if he punisht Venial Sins eternally; justice requiring a forbearance to punish that offence which deserves not punishment.* From all which it follows, that Divine pardon is so far from being an act of *free Grace* in the account of a Papist, that when he recites his *Pater Noster*, if his Devotions agree with his Doctrines, he may rather say, Lord pay us, than *forgive* us our debts.

Bin. Tom. 9. c. 46.

Injustum est punire peccata venialia pœnâ æternâ. *Lib.* 1. *de Amiss. Grat. c.* 14.

My fourth Argument shall be taken from *Christ his rejecting of this Pharisaical depravation* of the Law of God, that some *commands* of the Law, and *some Sins* against those commands are so *small* and slight that God will not require a perfect fulfilling of the Law, as to lesser and smaller commands, nor the necessary avoiding of such Sins as are against those smaller commands. The words of Christ are these, *Mat.* 5. 18. *Till Heaven and Earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfill'd.* The Lord *Christ* by these words, wherein he shews 'tis impossible that any thing in the Law, though accounted never so *small*, should pass from it, but all must be fulfill'd with a perfect Satisfaction, opposeth the *Pharisees*, who taking it for granted that there was necessarily required to righteousness and life, a *perfect* fulfilling of the Law, and yet finding that it was *impossible* to keep the *minutissima legis*, as to abstain from all sinful inward motions in the mind and heart, from every idle word, &c. to have such a perfect conformity to the Law, that there should be no lusting contrary to it, coyned this distinction, that some of the commands of the Law were *small*, and some *great*; and though none could in those little commands against sinful motions of the heart, perfectly satisfie the Law, yet if he kept the *great*

4. *Arg.*

Commandments of the Law, concerning *outward acts* and *works* of the Law, he should be just before God, since those Commands of *little things* were but little Commands, and therefore would not condemn a man for transgressing of them, provided that he perform'd the *external* works commanded in those *great Commands*. Now *Christ* vehemently *denies that there are any commands of the Law so small and minute, as that God would not much regard them, or of which in the establishing the righteousness of the Law before God, a man should give no account for the breaking of them, but God would account him righteous whether he observed them or no.* And therefore to shew the necessity of fulfilling the Law in the most *perfect and exact* manner, Christ assures, there should not pass from the Law one jot or tittle thereof that should not be fulfil'd; not *a jot, the least letter*, not a *tittle, the least point*, but was so highly accounted of by God, that before they should pass away without being fulfil'd, *Heaven and Earth should pass away*. So that there was required to the fulfilling of the Law, that all things in it, even to the *least apex* or *tittle*, should be fulfill'd. To which Doctrine of Christ agrees that of *Moses* and *Paul*, *Gal.* 3. 10. who denounced a *Curse* not only against those who continued not in the *great things*, but in *all things written in the Law*. And of *James* 2. 10. who saith, *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one, shall be guilty of all*; and this *one* is here to be taken for *any* one. As *Luk.* 15. 2. *If he have an hundred sheep and lose one*, that is, *any* one. So *Mat.* 10. 42. *Whosoever shall give a cup of cold water to one*, that is, to *any* one of the least Believers, *&c.* So that *unum, one*, is equivalent to *quodlibet*, as here, *one jot or tittle* of the Law, that is, *any one* jot or tittle of the Law *shall not pass away, but must be fulfil'd.*

Christus fortissimè negat esse quædam mandata in lege ita minuta, quæ Deus non multum curat, quorum etiam quamvis non impleantur, non sit habenda ratio in statuendâ justitiâ legis coram Deo. Ut itaq; perfectissimam legis impletionem, necessariam esse Christus ostendat, ne unum quidem literæ apicem cadere pronuntiat, quod non sit necesse impleri. *Chemnit. c.* 51. *Harm. p.* 337. *mihi.* Cujus præstantissima Commentaria in hunc locum opto ut inspiciant lectores & perlegant.

5. *Arg.* My fifth Argument is taken from that *macula*, or *stain*, or *filth*, that every Sin, even the *least* and *lightest*, leaves behind it. This *stain* left behind the commission of every Sin, is by several considered several ways: Either as an *habitual aversion* from God; or as an habitual disconformity to the Law of God; or as the *impairing of inherent Grace*, (the beauty of the Soul), and the weakning of its acts; or as a greater habitude and inclination to Sin; In regard of some, or all of these left upon the Soul after the commission of any Sin, 'tis said, *that Sin defiles and pollutes*, Mat. 15. 11, 18. *Rev.* 22. 11. and that every Sin is a spot, *Ephes.* 5. 27. and filthiness, 2 *Cor.* 7. 1. *Jam.* 1. 12. *Ezek.* 24. 13. *Ezek.* 36. 25. and when a man repents of Sin, and hath Sin pardoned to him, he is said to be washt and cleansed, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. 2 *Cor.* 7. 1. *Ezek.* 36. 25, 33. And because we are said to be *cleansed*, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *from all Sin*, therefore *all* Sins, even such as Papists call *Venial*, leave a spot and stain upon the Sinner, even as *Vasquez* the Jesuit confesseth. Now since there's this stain and defilement befals us after *every Sin*, there follows an

Negari non potest hominem vere manere pollutum ex peccato veniali, quod semel commisit, donec ab eo justificetur; nam qui à peccato veniali justificatur, vere dicitur ab eo emundari. *Vasquez in* 1a. 2dæ. *Disp.* 139. *c.* 4.

an *exclusion for all Sin, from the Kingdom of Heaven, into which no unclean thing shall enter*, Rev. 21. 27. and that Exclusion *Bellarmine* tells us, is proper to Mortal Sins; and indeed that which excludes from Heaven, must needs deserve eternal death, and so be Mortal. And that this Exclusion is not to all, *perpetual*, 'tis not from the nature of *Sin*, nor from the cleansing virtue of any *Purgatory-fire*, but meerly of God in Christ pardoning and purifying. Lib. 1. de amiss. Grat. cap. 5.

My sixth Argument is taken from the *Power of God*, justly to *forbid* the least Sin under the *pain of an eternal penalty*. Now if God can justly *prohibit* the least Sins, under an *eternal penalty*, then may he justly punish those *Sins prohibited*, with that *eternal* penalty. And that God may *prohibit* the least Sin under an eternal penalty, is evident, not only because the Will of God forbidding any Sin under an eternal penalty, is a sufficent reason of that penalty, and makes the punishment proportionable to the demerit of the Sin; but because God hath *actually* prohibited under pain of eternal punishment, things in themselves *lawful and indifferent*, as abstinence from several kinds of Meats, Blood, &c. and therefore surely he may forbid all Sin under that penalty: Yea God in the *Covenant of Works* made with *Adam*, actually prohibited *all Sin* under the penalty of *eternal death*: Which is evident, because if God *promis'd eternal life* to *Adam*, upon *condition* of *perfect* Obedience, certainly the commission of the *least Sin* would have made *Adam* liable to eternal death; for he that performs not the condition prescrib'd in the Covenant, cannot obtain the reward, but contrarily deserves the punishment appointed against those who violate the Covenant; But if *Adam* had committed the least Sin, he had not performed the condition prescrib'd in the Covenant, which was perfect Obedience; therefore he had deserved the penalty appointed against the violators of the Covenant. And if the Covenant of Works bound not *Adam* to avoid *every Sin* for the escaping of eternal death, then it bound him (as the Covenant of Grace binds us) to repent of Sin for the escaping of eternal death, there being no remission of any Sin, or avoiding of eternal punishment for it without repentance: But under the Covenant of Works there was no Obligation to *repentance* for Sin; for if there had been any Obligation to *repentance* for Sin, there must have been a promise of *pardon* upon *repentance*; but that's false, because the promise of pardon belongs only to the Covenant of Grace, pardon being only bestow'd through Christ. 6. *Arg.*

Seventhly, I argue from the *Typical remission of Sins in the Old Testament*; for they were then commanded to offer Sacrifices, not only for *greater* and more enormous offences, but for their *lesser Sins*, as those of *infirmity* and *ignorance*, which the *Papists* call and account *Venial*. As is evident from *Levit.* 4. 2, 12, 13, &c. and *Lev.* 5. 17. Now those Sacri- 7. *Arg.*

Synopſ. pur. Theol. de pec. adh. pag. mihi 176.

fices reſpected that *only* Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, by which *all* our Sins are expiated, as Chriſt was *made a curſe for us that he might deliver us from the curſe*, Gal. 3. 13. And from this (ſaith the learned *Walæus*), *Invictè demonſtratur*, 'tis invincibly demonſtrated, That every Sin of it ſelf is *Mortal*.

8. *Arg.* Eighthly, I argue from the *infinity of evil* that is in every Sin, to its deſert of an *infinite puniſhment*. That every Sin is an infinite evil, is moſt certain; I mean not that 'tis infinite *intenſivè*, as to it ſelf or bulk, (as I may ſay) for as the Sinner is but finite, ſo Sin is a privation but of a *finite rectitude*; and if every Sin were infinite in its *intenſiveneſs*, all Sins would be equal. But yet two ways Sin is infinite: 1. *Objectivè*, becauſe committed againſt an infinite Majeſty. 2. *Extenſivè*, and in reſpect of its *duration*, becauſe its *ſtain* and defilement laſt *for ever*, in regard of the Sinner, who *cannot* of himſelf *repent*. In like manner there's an infinite *puniſhment* due to Sin, (I mean not a puniſhment infinite *intenſivè*, for a *finite* Creature cannot be capable of an *infinite* torture); but yet an infinite *puniſhment* is due to Sin two ways, as *Sin* was ſaid to be two ways infinite: 1. A puniſhment is due to Sin, infinite *Objectivè*, by the Sinners being deprived of that *infinite good*, againſt whom he hath here offended, and whom he hath here neglected and deſpiſed. 2. A puniſhment infinite *extenſivè*, in reſpect of its *duration for ever*, becauſe the *ſtain* contracted from Sin commited in this life, endures for ever; and therefore the wicked who continue for ever *ſædi*, filthy and unclean, continue for ever *Dei Conſortio indigni*, unworthy of ever having Communion with God. *Qui nunquam deſinit eſſe malus, nunquam deſinit eſſe miſer*; he that never ceaſeth to be evil, never ceaſeth to be miſerable. The moſt *Venial* fault therefore, being *an infinite fault*, deſerves an *infinite* puniſhment. That 'tis an infinite fault, 'tis plain, becauſe 'tis againſt the infinite Majeſty of the Law-giver, and becauſe its ſtain of it ſelf, and without the mercy of God, endures for ever.

9. *Arg.* Ninthly, That *all Sins*, even ſuch as Papiſts call *Venial Sins*, *deſerve* an eternal puniſhment is evident, becauſe the *leaſt Sins* of Reprobates, *idle words ſhall be puniſht* with eternal puniſhment. That thoſe leaſt Sins ſhall be puniſht *eternally*, is plain from *Mat.* 12. 36, 37. *Every idle word that men ſhall ſpeak, they ſhall give account thereof in the day of judgment; for by thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy words thou ſhalt be condemned.* This *condemnation* here mention'd by *Chriſt*, plainly imports an *eternal puniſhment*; for in the day of Judgment there will be no condemnation to a *temporal* puniſhment. And that therefore the *leaſt Sins deſerve* eternal puniſhment is evident, becauſe otherwiſe the puniſhment which ſhall be inflicted for theſe Sins, would not be juſt, and proportionable to their demerit.

Nor can the *Papiſts* ſhun the force of this Argument, by ſaying, That 'tis

'tis meerly by *accident* that *Venial Sins* are puniſht with *eternal death*, not in regard of *themſelves*, but becauſe of the *condition of the ſubject* of theſe *Venial Sins*; which Sins by accident in Reprobates cannot be repented of, becauſe they are joined with *Mortal Sins* that exclude Grace neceſſary to repentance: This pittiful ſhift (I ſay) will not at all help the Papiſts; for theſe ſmaller Sins (which they call *Venial*) are of and by *themſelves* the cauſe of *condemnation* to an *eternal puniſhment*, as is evident from this place, *Mat.* 12. 36, 37. where *Chriſt* proves that an *account* ſhall be given *of every idle word*, becauſe by our *words we ſhall be condemned*; by which expreſſion he manifeſtly ſhews, that thoſe *idle words* of which he ſpake, though *Papiſts* count them *Venial*, are yet of *themſelves* a *ſufficient* cauſe of *condemnation* to *eternal puniſhment*; and beſides, if it be *unjuſt* (as *Bellarmine* blaſphemouſly ſpeaks) to *puniſh Venial Sins with eternal death*, becauſe they *deſerve* it not; and if a Venial Sin by its conjunction with a Mortal Sin in a Reprobate, is not made greater or deſerving of a greater puniſhment, but retains the *ſame nature* that it had before, it will then unavoidably follow, (if *of it ſelf* and in its *own nature* it deſerves not eternal puniſhment, that as 'tis in a *reprobate* joined with a Mortal Sin), it cannot *deſerve* eternal puniſhment, and by conſequence, it is not *puniſht* with an eternal puniſhment; for if it were, God ſhould puniſh Sins beyond their deſert. Nor can the Papiſts come off (as *Baronius* well obſerves) by ſaying, Though a *Venial Sin by a conjunction with Mortal Sin*, is not made more *grievous* and *hainous*, yet it is more *durable* by that conjunction; as having thereby an *eternal duration* of that *ſtain* which follows it, becauſe without repentance, which by a Mortal Sin is hindred, there's no taking away of that ſtain. This ſubterfuge (I ſay) is very inſufficient; for the faults in Reprobates, which Papiſts call *Venial*, either *in themſelves* do, or do *not deſerve* eternal death; if they *do not* deſerve eternal death, then they are puniſhed *beyond* their deſert, (which is blaſphemy to ſay), If they *do deſerve* eternal death, then that deſert of eternal death is founded in the hainouſneſs of *the faults themſelves*; and eternal death is inflicted, not alone for the *duration* of the *ſtain* of thoſe Sins, but for the demerit of the offences *themſelves*; to which the Scripture expreſly agrees, which teſtifies, that eternal puniſhment in the day of Judgment, ſhall be inflicted for thoſe things *done in the body*, 2 *Cor.* 5.10. ſo *Mat.* 25.42, 43. And hence 'twas that *Scotus*, *Biel*, *Vega*, and *Medina*, becauſe they ſaw that if *Venial Sins* were puniſht *eternally*, they ſhould be ſo puniſht becauſe of what they were in *themſelves*, and in their own nature, and by the demerit of the offence, labour to put off all, by aſſerting, that the puniſhment wherewith the *Damned in Hell* are puniſht for *Venial Sins*, is not *eternal*, but *temporal*, and that it ſhall at length have *an end*, though their puniſhment inflicted on them for *Mortal Sins* ſhall laſt for *ever*: But others of their own Fraternity, condemn this juſtly for an *abſurd* opinion, particularly their great

Scot. in 4. ſent. diſtinct. 21. qu. 1.

Si vera sit sententia *Scoti*, sequitur posse nos orare pro iis qui sunt in inferno, ut citius solvantur à pœnâ debitâ pro his peccatis; siquidem illa tandem, postquam satis passum sit, à Deo dimittenda est. *Vasq. in* 1a. 2dæ. *Disp.* 141. *c.* 2.

great *Vasquez* the Jesuit, thus confuting it: *If* (saith he) *the opinion of* Scotus *be true, viz. That the Venial Sins of Reprobates shall not be punisht in Hell eternally; It will follow, That we may pray for those in Hell, that they may be freed from the punishment due to their Venial Sins, if that punishment after they have suffered long enough, be by God to be taken off.*

10. *Arg.* Lastly, I argue from the *ridiculous absurdity* of the Doctrine of *Veniality of Sin*, to the *erroneousness of it*. The way, say the *Papists*, how *Sins Venial* come to be expiated and removed, is either in this life, or in the next: *In this life by, Sprinkling with holy Water, Confession to a Priest, beating the Breast, Whipping, saying the Lords-Prayer, Crossing, eating no Flesh, giving to the Church, &c.* In the *next life* Venial Sins are only expiated by the most torturing flames of *Purgatory*, greater than any tortures here in this life, yea as tormenting as Hell-fire, setting aside its duration (as the Papists say) and oft to be endured many hundreds of years. I demand then, If in this life a Venial Sin may be expiated with a *toy*, as sprinkling with holy Water, and Crossing, or the doing that which oft is, and always should be done with *cheerfulness*, as giving Alms, and yet in the next world it requires so many years of torturing flames to expiate it; what is the *reason of this difference* of the ways of expiating *Venial Sin*, that *here* it may be done with a *sport*, and *there* it requires such long and *inexpressible tortures* in fire a thousand times hotter than any here in this world, and as grievous as the torments of Hell? To this question the Papists answer, The *Sinner* is in the fault, who did not by so light and easie a way, expiate his Sin while here he lived; here he neglected his duty, and therefore there he smarts for it. But then I demand again, was that neglect of doing his duty in *this* world a *Mortal* Sin, or was it a *Venial* Sin? If a *Mortal* or damnable Sin, it should have carry'd the offender to *Hell*; If a *Venial* Sin, the difficulty again returns, Why may it not be expiated as eatily as other *Venial* Sins are?

Confiteor, tundo, conspergor, Conteror, oro; Signor, edo, dono, per hæc Venialia pono.

At ego rursus quæro; istud peccatum sitne Mortale, an Veniale? Si Mortale, in Purgatorium non venit; si Veniale, cur non eodem jure censetur quo reliqua Venialia? *Sadeel* de vera peccat. remiss. *p. mihi* 609.

Having now produced what I judg'd sufficient for *Confirmation* of this Truth against the *Veniality of Sin*, I could add many Allegations out of the *Fathers*, which abundantly testifie their consent with Protestants in this point. As out of *Jerome* who hath these words *in quintum ad Galat. It matters not whether a man be excluded from blessedness by one Sin, or by more, since all alike exclude.* Out of *Nazianzen*, *Every Sin is the death of the Soul.* Out of *Augustine* especially, besides what I have formerly mentioned

Non refert an uno quis excludatur peccato à beatitudine, an à pluribus, cum omnia similiter excludant. *Hieron.* in 5. *ad Galat.* Πασα ἁμαρτια παραλυει τὴν ψυχὴν. Nazianz. in Orat. Funeb. in Mort. patris. Peccata parva si contra nos collecta fuerint, ita nos oppriment, sicut unum aliquod grande peccatum. Quid interest ad naufragium, utrum uno grandi fluctu navis obruatur, an paulatim subrepens aqua, navem submergat. *Aug. Ep.* 108.

tioned in this Diſcourſe, who *Epiſt.* 108. ſaith, *Our little Sins, if gathered together againſt us, will preſs us down as much as one great Sin. What difference is there between a Shipwrack cauſed by one great Wave, and by the Water that ſinks the Ship, which comes into it by little and little.* The ſame Father, *Tract.* 12. in *Joh.* ſpeaks thus, *Little Sins neglected, deſtroy as well as great ones.* But to avoid needleſs prolixity, I ſhall but very briefly diſpatch this whole Diſcourſe, with but naming the Heads of thoſe many Inferences from it, which have taken me up much time elſewhere. And theſe Inferences might be,

Minuta peccata ſi negligantur, occidunt. *Tract.* 12. in *Joh.*

1. Speculative and Controverſal.
2. Practical.

3d. General Application.

Firſt, For Controverſal Inferences.

I. If *every* Sin, even *Venial*, be damnable, *as breaking the Law* (as hath been proved) and none can live without them (as Papiſts confeſs) 'tis clear then, that now *none can in this life perfectly keep the* Law. 1.

Secondly, If no Sins be *Venial*, but all *mortiferous* and damnable, and make us guilty of Eternal Death, then down falls *merit ex condigno*, Merit by the worthineſs of any works; for *to be guilty of death, and to deſerve eternal Life, cannot ſtand together.* 2.

Thirdly, *Purgatory is but a Fable*, if no Sins be Venial; Why ſhould that Fire *burn*, if it be not *purgative*? or rather, how can it *burn*, if it have no *Fewel*? 3.

II. The Practical Inferences, which are many, I ſhall but name.

Firſt, If every Sin be damnable and mortiferous; then *Sin is of a very hainous* Nature. There's more malignity in an idle Word, and Injuſtice againſt God in a *vain thought*, than that all the World can expiate, more weight in it, than all the ſtrength of Angels are able to bear. 1.

Secondly, If the *leaſt* Sins are mortiferous, *What then are the greateſt?* If a Grain preſſeth to Hell; If an Atom can weigh down like a Mountain; What then can a Mountain do? If *whiſpering* Sins ſpeak ſo loud; What then do *crying* ones, Bloody Oaths, Adultery, Murder, Oppreſſion? 2.

Thirdly, If every *ſingle* Sin be damnable, *What then are all our Sins?* Millions of Sins, Sins of all our Ages, Conditions, Places that ever we lived in, Relations? If all were (as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeaks) *Contra nos Collecta*, gathered into one heap againſt us, what an *heaven-reaching mountain* would they make? 3.

Fourthly, If every Sin be damnable and mortiferous, *God is to be juſtified in the greateſt temporal ſeverities which he* inflicts upon us. As God never puniſheth ſo ſeverely here, but *he can puniſh more*; ſo he never here puniſheth ſo ſeverely, but we *deſerve* more and greater ſeverities. Pains, Flames, Sword, Peſtilences, thoſe *tonſuræ inſolentis generis hu-* 4.

mani,

mini, those *mowings* down of so many Millions, are all short of damnation, deserved by Sin. God is to be justified in sending such Judgments, as the Fire of *London*, and the Tempest lately in *Vtrecht*.

5. Fifthly, *They who instigate others to Sin are damnable* and mortiferous *Enemies to* Souls. They draw to an Eternal Punishment. Soul-Murder is the greatest, and Soul-Murderers most resemble the Devil in *carriage*, and shall in *condemnation*. How deeply dyed are those Sins and Sinners that are dipt in the Blood of Souls!

6. Sixthly, *'Tis no Cowardise to fear Sin.* Of *all fear*, that of Sin is most *justifiable*. 'Tis not *magnanimity* but *madness*, not valour, but fool-hardiness, to be *bold to Sin*. Surely, the boldness of Sinners, since Sin deserves Eternal Death, is not from want of *danger*, but *discerning*.

7. Seventhly, How *excusable are Ministers* and all Christian *Monitors, that warn against Sin.* They bid you take heed of *damnation*. To warn against which with the *greatest*, is the *mercifullest severity*.

8. Eighthly, How *madly sinful is it to be merry in Sin*! to make a *mock of it*! What's this but to *sport* with *Poyson*, and to *recreate* our selves with *damnation?* If here men are counted to *play* before us, when they are sinning, *'twill be bitterness in the* end. There's no Folly so great as to be pleased with the Sport that Fools make us, nor are any Fools like those that dance to damnation.

9. Ninthly, *Unconceivably great is the patience of God toward Sinners*, especially *great ones*: Gods patience discovers it self eminently, in that he spares *damnable* Sins, though he *sees* them, *hates* them infinitely more than we can do, is *able* to punish them every moment, is infinitely the Sinners *Superior*, yea seeks to *prevent* their punishment by warning, intreaties, threats, counsels; yea, puts forth daily Acts of *mercy* and bounty towards those who sin damnably; yea, he waits, and is long-suffering oft scores, and hundreds of years, though this waiting shews (not that he will *always spare* but) that we should *now repent*.

10. Tenthly, *'Tis our Interest to be holy betimes*; 'tis good, that as much as may be of that which is so *damnable*, should be prevented. Shouldst thou be converted *in old age*, 'twill be thy extream sorrow that it was so *late*, though thy happiness it was *at all*. *Early repentance makes an easie Death-bed*, and makes joyful the last Stage of our journey unto Eternal Joyes.

11. Eleventhly, No *smalness of sin should occasion boldness to commit it.* 1. In some Cases, the *smalness* of the *inducement* to Sin, the slightness of the matter of thy Sin, *aggravates* the offence. To deny a Friend a *Cup of Water*, is a greater unkindness than to deny him a thousand pounds: What, wilt thou stand with *God* for a *trifle*, and damn thy Soul for a *toy?* wilt thou prefer a *peny* before God and Glory? 2. *Small Sins* are more *difficultly shunned*; A small bone of a Fish easily gets into the Throat, and 'tis hard to avoid it: And 3. *Small Sins dispose to greater*; the Wimble makes way for the Auger. 4. *Sins many*, though *small*,

1. Parvitas materiæ aggravat.
2. Parva difficilius cavent-ur.
3. Parva viam muniunt ad majora.
4. Minuta & multa sunt ut unum grande.

small are as *one great one*; An heap of Sands presseth to death as well as a Sow of Lead; A Ship may sink *by Water* coming in at *a Leak*, drop by drop, as well as when overwhelmed with *a great Wave*. As *Austin* speaks.

Twelfthly, I note, The great reason why *Christ should* be dear to us. Thou canst not be *without him*, no not for thy *little*, *thy least* Sins, and those of *dayly incursion*. Oh! that this Doctrine might make you and me prize Christ more, as long as we live. Because the Best cannot live without *small* Sins, neither can they live without a *great Saviour*; none of us can live without these smaller Sins, (as the very Papists grant) but oh that we may take a wiser course to get pardon of them, than they do, by our looking upon Gods *pity* through Christs Blood, as our only *Purgatory*. The *Pharisees* (of old) saw that we could not live without breaking the Law in smaller things (as we have shewn before) but let us more study than they did, Gods *design* in giving a Law which fain-Man is not able to keep. The Apostle tells us Gods design herein; *He aimed at Christ*, Rom. 10. 4. who was *intended* by God as his end in giving such a Law which fain-Man could not keep; namely, that Sinners might seek after his Righteousness, by seeing their own inability to keep it. How much do we want *Christ* at *every turn*, for our smallest inadvertencies, impertinent, wandring thoughts, in the adjacent defects and defilements of our holy things! Lord, I want thy Blood, as often as I fetch my breath! 12.

Lastly, I infer the *happiness* of *Believers* under the *Covenant of Grace*. *Ex rigore Legis*, the least Sins damn, and none of us but every *day* and in every *duty*, commit them; but here's the Comfort, we are delivered through Christ, from that damnation which we deserve for all those unavoidable defects and evils, that attend the *Best in* their *best* observing the Law of God; we being loosed under the Covenant of Grace, from that *rigid exaction* of the Law, which suffers no Sin to go without Eternal punishment, and *delivered by Christ from the necessity of a perfect and exact fulfilling the Law of God*, *under pain of damnation*. 'Tis true, the Law still commands, even Believers, *perfect obedience*, and 'tis a Sin in Believers under the Covenant of Grace, that they do not obey the Law of God to the utmost perfection thereof; but here's our happiness, that Christ hath obtained, that the *imperfection* of our Obedience shall not *damn* us, but that our imperfect Obedience to the Law, shall through him be accepted. If indeed there were only the *Law and no Christ*, no Obedience but that which is *absolutely perfect*, could be entertained by God; but now, though *by the Law*, perfect Obedience be *required*, yet *by Grace*, imperfect (if sincere) Obedience is accepted; For *under the Covenant of Grace*, *strictly and precisely under pain of damnation*, *we are only obliged to that measure of obedience which is possible by the help of Grace*; and hence it is, that Christs Yoke is called *easie*, which cannot be understood of the Law in its *rigor*, but as *mitigated* by the Covenant of Grace: Ult. Mat. 11. ult.

That Yoke would not be *easie* but *intolerable*, if it propounded no hope of Salvation, but under that *impossible condition of* perfect Obedience to the Law. And 1 *Joh.* 5. 3. *His commands are not grievous*; but so they would be, if their exactions were rigorous in requiring perfect Obedience *under pain of damnation*, of us that cannot perform it: But for ever blessed be God, that though our best Obedience be *imperfect*, yet the *perfect* Obedience of Christ imputed to us, supplies the *defect* of ours; yea, that our imperfect Obedience doth not only not damn us (though the imperfection thereof *deserves* damnation according to the rigor of the Law) but that it is ordained to be the *way* to our Salvation; I mean *not its imperfection*, but it, *notwithstanding* its imperfection. Reader, if thou art a Believer, till thy Love to Jesus Christ, prompts thee to a more suitable Ejaculation, accept of this for a Conclusion of this whole Discourse. *A saving Eternity, (Father of Mercy) will be short enough to praise thee for Him, who hath delivered us from those many millions of Sins, the least whereof deserve a damning Eternity: Dear Lord Jesus, who hast saved us from the least Sin that ever we had or did, help us to serve thee with the greatest Love, that our Souls can either admit or express. And as (through Grace) the guilt of the least Sin shall not lye upon us; so neither let the Love of the least Sin lodg within us. Thou who hast made our Justification perfect, dayly perfect what our Sanctification wants. And never (Lord) let us put limits to our thankful returns, for those satisfying sufferings of thine, that knew no Bounds, no Measure.*

SERMON

SERMON IX.

Publick Prayer ſhould be in a Known Tongue.

1 COR 14. 15.

I will Pray with the Spirit, and will Pray with Underſtanding alſo.

THe Spirit of God foreſeeing, That in the latter dayes there would be an Apoſtacy and departure from the Faith; and that impious and corrupt Doctrines, would be publiſhed by Men of corrupt minds; hath ſo compiled the holy Scriptures, that from thence even thoſe Errors which aroſe long after the times of the Apoſtles may be detected and confuted. With very good reaſon, did *Tertullian* ſay, *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, I adore the fulneſs of the Scripture* The Perfection and Sufficiency of it muſt needs be granted by all that underſtand it, and that will believe the Teſtimony, which it gives concerning it ſelf. 'Tis profitable πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, *for Doctrine and reproof.* It ſerves to inform and open the Eyes of the Ignorant, it ſerves to ſtop the Mouths of Gain-ſayers. Hence we may be furniſhed with both Offenſive and Defenſive Weapons: and the Armour which is fetched from it, is ſtiled τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός; *The Armour* or the *Weapons of Light*, Rom. 13. 12. And truly Sin and Error being but diſcovered, that very diſcovery, will have a great influence unto the mortification of the one, and our preſervation from the contagion of the other. Lib. adv. Hermogen. cap. 22.

I do not at all wonder that the Church of *Rome* ſhould take away the *Key of Knowledg.* Open but *that Door*; and that Command would more generally be obeyed, which you read *Rom.* 18. 4. *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her Sins, that ye receive not of her*

Plagues. The Popiſh leaders are very much againſt the Scriptures being known, becauſe it makes ſo much againſt them, and ſpeaks ſo plainly againſt their Doctrines; and they are jealous leſt their own men upon ſerious reading and conſideration might be brought to ſay, *Aut hoc non eſt Evangelium, aut nos non ſumus Evangelici*; Either this is not the Goſpel, or we are not Goſpellers. Either this Word of God is not true, or if it be true, then Popery is a meer falſhood.

That there is ſuch a great diſagreement between the Scripture and Popery, might eaſily be made manifeſt in all the Points of Controverſie between the *Romiſh* Church and Ours; we having departed from them upon this very ſcore, becauſe they have *rejected the Word of God*; and left that *Faith which was once deliver'd to the Saints.*

But the Point now to be inſiſted on, is, *The Language or Tongue, in which Prayer that is publick ought to be made.*

How near a kin is Myſtical *Babylon* unto *Babel* of old in the Land of *Shinar*? We read that there the aſpiring *builders Language was confounded, and they did not underſtand one anothers ſpeech*, Gen. 11.7. and this Confuſion ſtopt the building of that Tower which was deſigned to reach Heaven. In the Devotions of the *Romiſh* Church, the Prieſt ſpeaks but the People underſtand not what is ſpoken, and this is an impediment unto the Peoples Edification; ſo that their Devotions reach not Heaven, but are only *a ſpeaking into the air*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 9. and are as little regarded by God, as they are underſtood by themſelves. The Proteſtant Churches, on the other ſide, are for Prayer in a known Tongue; and good warrant they have from the Apoſtle himſelf, who ſays, *I will pray with the underſtanding*; and that in *the Church he had rather ſpeak five words*, i.e. a few words *with his underſtanding, that by his voice he might teach others alſo, than ten thouſand words in an unknown tongue.*

The Text informs us of the Apoſtles practice; which he propoſes, ſurely not that we ſhould diſlike it and refuſe to follow him but for our imitation. Three things are here to be conſider'd.

1. *What's meant by Prayer?* It muſt be underſtood *concerning publick* Prayer, or Prayer with others; for the Apoſtle in this Chapter where the Text lies is delivering a *Decency and Order*, which was to be obſerved in the Publick Aſſemblies; he ſuppoſes ſeveral perſons to be preſent, that might anſwer *Amen* to the Supplications and Thankſgivings that were made. This Interpretation, as *Beza* obſerves, is moſt agreeable with the ſcope of the Apoſtle, and the drift of his Diſcourſe.

Si de privatis precibus ageret, videri poſſet à ſuo propoſito aberrare. *Beza* in locum.

2. *What's meant by the Spirit?* I will pray *in the Spirit*; that is, *by the gift of Prayer which the Spirit beſtows.* This Expoſition I find in *Chryſoſtome*, τῷ πνεύματι, τουτέστι τῷ χαρίσματι. Extraordinary abilities of Prophecying and Praying were given after Chriſts Aſcenſion, and the Miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; and the end of all was the Churches Increaſe and Edification. Here 'tis not amiſs to add, That by comparing other places with this, we muſt grant, that praying in the Spirit, com-

Λογ. λς. in 1 Epiſt. ad Corinth.

pre-

prehends a great deal more than the *bare gift of utterance* in this duty, whether extraordinary in an unknown, or more ordinary in a known Language. To pray in the Holy Ghost, implys, and that chiefly, the having our infirmities helped by the Spirit of God; our Graces quickned; our affections and desires raised unto that strength and fervency; unto which the Lord for his Son our Advocates sake has promised satisfaction.

3. *What is meant by Understanding?* This must not be referred to the *Understanding of the Apostle*; for 'tis difficult to suppose that *He* at any time did not understand what himself did speak. But it relates *to the Understanding of others*; as *vers.* 19. *I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also.* To *teach with the Understanding*, in the Apostles sense, is to accommodate what we say to the Understanding and Capacity of those whom we teach. In like manner *to pray with the Understanding*; is to pray so, as that those whom we pray with, may apprehend what we beg for at the throne of Grace, and for what we return thanks unto God, else how is it possible they should be edified?

Upon the words thus opened I build this *Thesis* which I am to maintain: *That Publick Prayer is not to be made in an unknown tongue, but in such a Language as is understood by the common People.* In Publick Prayer I include Confessions of Sin, Petitions for Grace and Mercy, Intercessions for others, and giving of Thanks; which are uttered in the hearing of the Congregation: and I affirm, That all such Publick Worship and Service is to be performed in such a Tongue as the Congregation is acquainted with. Hearken to the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 14. 16, 17. *Else when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of Thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? for thou verily givest Thanks well, but the other is not edified. Chrysostome* upon these words speaks thus, Ἰδιώτην τὸν λαϊκὸν λέγει. By the man unlearned the Apostle means the Lay-man; even he must understand the words that are spoken in Prayer, that thereby he may be edified.

In the handling of this *Thesis*;

First, I shall give you *the judgment of the Church of Rome* in the matter.

Secondly, *Produce arguments to prove that Publick Prayer ought not to be made in an unknown Language.*

Thirdly, I shall make it manifest, *that Antiquity is utterly against the Papists in this business.*

Fourthly, *I shall answer the Objections of the* Romish *Doctors*; and shew the weakness of their Arguments, which they urge for their *Latin*, and by the People not understood, Service.

Fifthly, I shall *discover the Mystery of iniquity* in this Papal Doctrine, which preaches up and encourages to an ignorant Devotion.

Sixthly

Sixthly, Conclude *with a Practical Application.*

In the first place I am to give you the judgment of the Church of *Rome*. And that they indeed hold that Publick Prayer may be made in a Language that the People understand not, appears two ways.

1. By *their general Practice*. Their Mass-Book is in *Latin*, their Divine Service, and Offices, as they call them, are performed in the *Latin* Tongue. But this is certain, that the *Latin* Tongue is not now the Mother-Tongue of any Nation under Heaven. In former ages indeed 'twas spoken in *Italy*. But that Nation has been so often invaded and overrun by forreign enemies, especially by the *Goths* and *Vandals*; that there has been a great alteration in their Language; the present *Italian* being vastly different from that Language which the *Romans* of old used. But though *Latin* be not understood by the common People, yet in *Italy* and *Spain*, and *Germany*, and *France*, and other places, where the Pope governs and is obeyed, the Publick Service is *Latin*; and to teach, *that the People should understand what they pray for*, is declaim'd against as a piece of Heresie.

2. 'Tis not only the Practice of that Church to have *Latin* Prayers, nor the opinion only of some private Doctors, nor the judgment of a Provincial or National Synod that thus it ought to be; but that very Council of *Trent*, which they (though without reason) call Holy and Oecumenical, or General, does determine, that Prayer need not be made in a Vulgar Language. The words of the Council are these, *Sessio. 22. capit. 22.*

Etsi Missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est Patribus ut vulgari lingua passim celebraretur. Though the Mass do contain a great deal of instruction for the faithful people, yet it did not seem expedient to these Fathers that it should be every where celebrated in a vulgar tongue.

Indeed afterward they command that the Pastors *exponant aliquid*, expound something, but since *something* is only mention'd, and not *what*, nor *how much*, and to be sure *not all*; we may well say, *Hoc aliquid nihil est*; This something is as good as nothing. Moreover the ninth Canon runs thus:

Siquis dixerit lingua tantum vulgari Missam celebrari debere, Anathema sit. Whosoever shall say that the Mass ought to be celebrated only in a vulgar language, let him be accursed. You see how a Popish Council determines that Publick Prayer need not be in a known Tongue, and thunders out an Anathema against those who are otherwise minded.

In the second place follow the Arguments against the Papists, which prove that Publick Prayer ought not to be made in a Language unknown to the People.

1. When Prayer is made in an unknown Tongue, the Name of God is taken in vain. *Aquinas* speaks of four ways of taking Gods Name: 1. *Ad dicti confirmationem*, when we call God to witness the truth of what

what has been ſpoken. 2. *Ad Sanctificationem*, to the ſanctifying and ſeparating of a thing to an uſe that is holy; thus the water in Baptiſm is ſeparated to a Sacramental uſe, by the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt. 3. *Ad operis completionem*, unto the performing of any work which we undertake. Thus *David* went forth againſt *Goliah* in the Name of the Lord of Hoſts, whoſe Armies that proud Giant had defied. 4. *Ad confeſſionem & invocationem*, when we make confeſſion of Gods Name before others, or call upon his Name our ſelves.

Now when thus in Prayer we take the Name of God into our mouths we muſt remember the third Commandment, and how the Great Law-giver has expreſly ſignified, *that he will not hold the tranſgreſſors guiltleſs.* 'Tis the firſt Petition in the Lords-Prayer, *Hallowed be thy Name:* But how can thoſe that underſtand not the words of Prayer, hallow Gods Name? How can their hearts and their words go together? and if they don't, the Worſhip is vain. *Mat.* 15. 8, 9. *This people draweth nigh to me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; and in vain do they worſhip me.* The People in *Latin* Prayers underſtand not when Sin is confeſſed, nor when Pardon and Grace are asked, nor when praiſe is offered: How then can their hearts be ſuitably affected? It follows therefore that the Lords Name is taken, and an Ordinance uſed in vain. Certainly the end of Oral Prayer is not attained in the Church of *Rome.* The reaſon of uſing words in this duty is that others may underſtand, and join with us, and alſo that our own thoughts and hearts by the words may be kept more cloſe to God, and intent upon his ſervice; but in both theſe regards *Latin* Prayers to thoſe that underſtand not *Latin* are juſt as good as none at all.

2. Prayer in an unknown Tongue is ignorant Worſhip. The *Samaritans* were blamed by Chriſt *for worſhipping they knew not what*, Joh. 4. 22. And he ſpeaks by way of reprehenſion to his Diſciples, *Ye know not what ye ask.* So that not only the Object of Prayer muſt be known, but likewiſe the matter which we pray for. But in both theſe regards the poor Papiſts are miſerably ignorant. Their Idolatry plainly ſhews they have not right conceptions of the Godhead. How like are they to the Heathen *Romans* of old, who before their Converſion to the Chriſtian Faith, *changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man*, Rom. 1. 21. which is an evident Argument, *that they are become vain in their imaginations, and that their fooliſh hearts are darkned*, ver. 23. The Papiſts multiply Altars indeed, but upon all their Altars this Inſcription may be written, which was upon the Altar at *Athens*, Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ, They are dedicated to a *God they know not.*

And as they know not the God they pray to, ſo neither do they underſtand what they pray for. And what is ignorant Worſhip if this be not, *To make unknown Prayers to an unknown God?* Surely 'tis the will of God, we ſhould underſtand what we pray, but the Papiſts are willingly ignorant, and it abundantly ſuffices them, if ſo much time is but

waſted

wasted in their Devotions, and so many words are but pronounced, though they understand those words no more than a Parrot does the meaning of those words of ours which it has learned to imitate.

3. How can such Prayers as are made in an unknown Tongue, be made in Faith? and yet Faith is so necessary an ingredient in Prayer, that the Apostle sticks not to say, *Let not that man*, who asks not in Faith, *think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord*, Jam. 1. 7. We must believe that what we ask is according to the Will of God; to this end the Word which is the declaration of Gods Will ought to abide in us. *Joh.* 15. 7. *If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.* There must also in Prayer be a relyance upon the Promises of God, all which are *Yea and Amen in Christ:* But how can we either believe that we ask according to the Will of God; or relie upon those Promises which God hath made, if we know not what we pray?

Faith in Prayer, which is true, always presupposes knowledg; *How shall they call on him* (says the Apostle) *in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* Rom. 10. 14. He that understands not the Tongue in which the Prayers are made, cannot certainly tell whether the Lord be praised or blasphemed; whether Grace be implored, or liberty beg'd to continue in wickedness: Nay he cannot tell whether God be prayed to at all. How then shall a man in Faith be able to join in such manner of Supplications? And as this unknown Tongue is an impediment to Faith, so when what is asked is not understood, How can the Desires be lively? *Ignoti nulla cupido*: The Understanding must apprehend the evil before that evil can be heartily deprecated; and be convinced of the good before the Will is brought to embrace it.

4. The design of Prayer, is not to work any change *in God* with whom there is not the least variableness, neither shadow of turning; but a change *in us*; that by Prayer we may be the better disposed for the reception of what we ask. But how can Prayer which is not understood be here available? When this Duty is rightly performed, it tends to the making of us more sensible of our guilt and vileness, our neediness and insufficiency; and to the setting of a greater edge upon our affections, towards those Spiritual and Eternal Blessings which are promised in the New Covenant; and by this means we are made more meet for the accomplishment of those Promises. But Prayer in an unknown Tongue leaves Men as it found them. And they must needs continue under their deadness, their hearts being straitned and *alienated from God through the blindness that is in them.*

5. Though to speak in an unknown Tongue was in the first age of the Christian Church a Miraculous Gift, and served much for the confirmation of the Christian Faith. Yet *unless there were an interpreter*, the use of an unknown Tongue was not permitted in the Publick Worship of God,

1 Cor.

1 Cor. 14. 28. *If there be no Interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church, and let him speak to himself and to God.* Surely then it plainly follows, that Prayer with the Unlearned should not now be made in *Latin*, since skill in that Language is not now an extraordinary Gift, but gained by ordinary instruction and industry; and the use of it in Prayer with those that know not the meaning of it, tends not to confirm Christianity, but to hinder true Devotion.

6. The use of an unknown Tongue in the Lords Service is expresly denied to be unto Edification. The Apostle gives this general Rule, *Let all things be done to edifying*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 26. and *v.* 17. he before expresly says, That the Unlearned *is not edified* by Worship in a Language which he does not understand, though the Prayers or Praises be never so excellent. The Papists indeed that are devout in their way, may possibly imagin they are edified by their *Latin* Prayers; but they would do well to consider, that the Apostle speaks very plainly, That *an unknown Tongue is not to Edification*; and it concerns them likewise to suspect their own hearts, which are so deceitful, and to fear lest Satan by delusory Affections, and a false Peace, impose upon them. But let us suppose that they are really affected at their Devotions; certainly no thanks at all to the Prayer, the meaning of which they are utterly ignorant of.

Well then, since Prayer is to be unto Edification, it must be such as may be understood by the People. The Spiritual benefit and advantage of their Souls is to be regarded in all Publick Administrations. The Apostles had indeed the gift of Tongues in the day of *Pentecost*; but, which is very much to be marked, *It was not that they might speak in an unknown, but in a known Language to the People.* Therefore you read, that those *Parthians and Medes, and Elamites*, and the rest of them did say, *We do hear every one in the Tongue wherein we were born, the wonderful works of God*, Act. 2. 8, 12.

I might farther add, That it is repugnant to the very nature of Publick Prayer, that it should be in an unknown Tongue. For the People all the while if they are *at any*, are at *their private Devotions*, though in the Publick Assembly; while the Priest in *Latin* is confessing Sin, the Peoples hearts may be giving thanks for Mercy; while the Priest is asking for one kind of Blessing, the Peoples Affections may be carried out after another. Thus there is not *that agreeing together* in what they ask, which Christ speaks of; and which is necessary in Publick Prayer.

7. The Apostle having delivered this Doctrine, that Prayer and Praise should be in a known Tongue, adds at the close of the Chapter; not only, That he taught the *same in all Churches of the Saints*; but also, *If any man think himself to be a Prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledg, that the things which I write unto you are the Commandments of the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 37. So much for the Arguments against Prayer in an unknown Tongue.

In the third place I am to manifeſt, That *Antiquity* is utterly againſt the Church of *Rome* in this matter: the Papiſts talk much of the Fathers indeed; but how diſobedient they are to them, and how much they diſſent from them, may moſt eaſily be evinced.

And becauſe the Council of *Trent* hath Anathematized all that are againſt the Popiſh *Latin* Prayers, I will *ſuppoſe another Council*, and ſeveral of the moſt eminent, and ancient Fathers Members of it; and that I may deal the more fairly with our Adverſaries, I will ſuppoſe ſome of their own moſt noted and famous Doctors, admitted into this Council; and that yet it may be the more regarded, I ſhall ſuppoſe the Apoſtle *Paul* himſelf to be the Preſident of it.

The Fathers whom I ſhall mention are *Juſtin Martyr*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine*, *Hierome*, *Baſil*, and *Chryſoſtome*.

The Queſtion to be debated, is, *Whether Prayer is to be made in a known, or in an unknown Tongue?* Let the Fathers ſpeak in order.

Juſtin Martyr, who is very ancient, and lived about the year 160, *Apol.* 2. *ad Antoninum Pium, ſub finem*, tells us:

Καὶ τῇ τῶν ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα, τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Ἔπειτα παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τοῦ καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται; ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν, καὶ παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος.—Καὶ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ ἀμήν.

On the day commonly called Sunday, Aſſemblies are made of Citizens and Countrymen, and the writings of the Apoſtles and Prophets are read: The Reader giving over, the Miniſter makes an Exhortation to the People, perſwading to the imitation and practice of thoſe good things that are propounded. After this we riſe all and pour out Prayers, and Bread and Wine are brought forth, and the Miniſter to the uttermoſt of his ability, does ſend forth Prayers and Praiſes unto God, and the People give their conſent, ſaying, Amen.

Behold the Scriptures read even to Citizens, nay to Country-People, and Prayers made which they did underſtand, and ſay Amen to.

Origen may ſpeak next, *Lib.* 8. *Contra Celſum* pag. (*mihi*) 402. Οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις γεγραπταῖς νομίμοις ὀνόμασι χρῶνται τετάγμενοις ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ χρῶνται ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ἑλληνικοῖς, οἱ δὲ ῥωμαῖοι ῥωμαϊκοῖς; καὶ ἕτερος ἑκάστου κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὐχεται θεῷ καὶ ὑμνεῖ ἀυτὸν ὡς δύναται; καὶ ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου εὐχομένων ἀκούει. *The Chriſtians in their Prayers uſe not the very words* (he means the Words in the Original) *of the Scriptures; but they that are Greeks do uſe the Greek Tongue, and thoſe that are Romans the Roman Tongue; and ſo every one according to his Dialect, does Pray unto God, and praiſe him according to his ability; and He that is the Lord of every Language, does hear the Prayers which are put up to Him in every Language.*

Cyprian *De Orat. Domin.* pag. (*mihi*) 309. ſpeaks thus:

Aliter Orare quam docuit Christus, non ignorantiæ solùm, sed & culpæ; quando ipse posuerit & dixerit, rejicitis mandatum Dei ut Traditionem vestram statuatis.

To Pray otherwise than Christ has taught, is not only ignorance, but a great fault; for he has expresly said, ye rejected the Command of God, that ye may establish your own Tradition. Now where has Christ taught the use of an unknown Tongue in Prayer? 'tis but *Romes* Invention and Tradition, and that not of a very long standing.

Ambrose may be heard in the next place, in 1. *ad Corinth. c.* 14.

Si utique ad ædificandam Ecclesiam convenitis, ea deberet dici quæ intelligant audientes: nam quid prodest si quis linguâ loquatur quam solus scit, ut qui audit nihil proficiat?

If ye come together to edifie the Church, those things ought to be spoken that the hearers may understand; for what does he profit the People who speaks in an unknown Tongue to them? And afterwards the same Father adds; *There were some; of the* Hebrews *especially, that used the* Syriack, *and the* Hebrew *Tongue in their Services; but these aimed at their own glory and commendation, not at the Peoples benefit.* Though the *Hebrew* Tongue was that in which God of old utter'd the Law upon Mount *Sinai*, that which *Moses* and the Prophets used; though the *Syriack* was that in which our Lord himself spake while he was upon Earth; yet *Ambrose* blames those that prayed in these Languages with those People who did not understand them. After *Ambrose*, let us hear *Augustine*, *Enarrat. in Psalmum* 18.

Intelligere debemus, ut humanâ ratione non quasi avium voce cantemus, Merulæ, Psittaci, Corvi, Picæ, & hujusmodi volucres sæpe docentur ab hominibus sonare quæ nesciunt: scienter vero cantare non avi sed homini divinâ voluntate concessum est.

We ought to understand what we pray for, that we may not like Birds, but like men, sing unto God. For Black-birds and Parrots, and Crows, and Pies, and such kind of Fowls, are taught to sound forth what they understand not: But to sing (which certainly in the Psalms of *David* includes Prayer and Praising) *with understanding, is granted not to a Bird, but to a Man through the good pleasure of God.*

From this Fathers words you may perceive, that the not-understood Prayer of a Papist is likened unto the prating of a Pye, or Parrot.

Hierom, who was famous for his skill in Languages, and was himself a Presbyter of the Ancient Church in *Rome*, yet speaks after this manner, *Præfat. in Epist. ad Galatas.*

In Ecclesiis Urbis Romæ *quasi tonitrus Cœleste audimus Populum reboantem, Amen. In the Churches of the City of* Rome, *the Voice of the People was like Heavenly Thunder, when they answered aloud, Amen*, at the end of the Prayers which they put up unto God.

The People understood, and gave their consent unto the Prayers which were used in those days; but the present Church of *Rome*, *Heu quantum*

quantum mutatur ab illâ! Alas, how much is it altered from what it once was!

Again the ſame *Hierom* ſpeaks, *Sub finem Comment. in Epiſt. ad Galatas.*

Quod autem Amen conſenſum ſignificet audientis & ſit ſignaculum veritatis ad Corinthios *prima nos docet, in qua* Paulus *ait Cæterum ſi benedixeris Spiritu, qui ſupplet locum idiotæ, quomodo dicet Amen ſuper tua benedictione, quoniam quidem neſcit quid dicas: ex quo oſtendit non poſſe idioten reſpondere verum eſſe quod dicitur, niſi intellexerit quod docetur.*

Amen ſignifies the conſent of the hearer, and is a ſealing of the Truth: Paul *ſays, If thou bleſs with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned ſay Amen at thy giving of thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt? whereby he declares, That the unlearned Man cannot anſwer, that that which is ſpoken is true, ſince he does not underſtand it.*

Great *Baſil*, his mind you may know concerning the propoſed Queſtion, *Homil. in Pſalmum* 28. Having complained before that the Children of Men do not in His Temple give glory unto God, he adds; Ἡ γλῶσσα ψαλλέτω, ὁ δὲ τῆς ἑρμηνάτω τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ἡημάτων, ἵνα ψάλλῃς τῷ πνεύματι, ψάλλῃς δὲ καὶ τῷ νοΐ. *Let thy Tongue ſing, and let thy Mind ſearch the meaning of what is ſpoken, that according to the Apoſtle, thou mayeſt ſing with the Spirit, and ſing with underſtanding alſo.*

Chryſoſtom agrees with the forementioned Fathers fully, Λογ. λς *in* 1 *Epiſt. ad Corinth.*

Ἰδιωτὴν τὸν λαϊκὸν λέγει, καὶ δείκνυσι ἄνδρα ὁ μικρὰν ζημίαν ὑπομένοντα, ὅταν τὰ ἀμεῖνω οἰκεῖν μὴ δύνηται. *Take notice, ſays he, how the Apoſtle does always ſeek the Churches Edification. By the unlearned Man,* Paul *means the Layman, and ſhews how this unlearned Perſon does ſuſtain a very great loſs, when Prayers are made in ſuch a Language, as he through want of underſtanding is not able to ſay Amen to them.*

I ſhall add unto theſe paſſages of the Fathers, a Conſtitution of the Emperor *Juſtinian*. Emperors of old were reverenced by the Church, though now the Pope endeavours to Lord it over them. The Conſtitution is this. *Novel. Conſtit.* 123.

Jubemus omnes Epiſcopos, *&c. We command that all Biſhops and Presbyters do celebrate the Holy Oblation, and Prayers uſed in Holy Baptiſm, not ſpeaking low, but with a clear Voice which may be heard by the People, that thereby the Minds of the People may be ſtirred up with greater Devotion in uttering the Praiſes of the Lord God.* And for this is cited 1 *Cor.* 14. *How ſhall the Unlearned ſay Amen, if he does not underſtand what is ſpoken?* And then it follows, *If the Prieſts neglect theſe things, the Judgment of God and Chriſt will fall on them; neither will we,* ſays the Emperor, *when we know it, reſt and leave it unrevenged.*

But now let us hear the Romiſh Doctors themſelves ſpeaking to the Queſtion in Hand.

Cardinal

Cardinal *Cajetan*, *Comment. in 1 Epiſt. ad Corinth. c.* 14. has theſe words; *Ex hac* Pauli *Doctrina habetur, quod melius eſt ad ædificationem Eccleſiæ, orationes publicas, quæ audiente Populo dicuntur, dici linguâ communi Clericis, & Populo, quam dici Latinè.*

From this Doctrine of the Apoſtle Paul *it follows, That it is better for the edification of the Church, that the publick Prayers which the People hear, ſhould be made in that Language which both the Prieſts and People underſtand, than that they ſhould be made in Latin.*

Here I cannot chuſe but cry out, *Magna eſt Veritas*, great is Truth, and it will prevail! Behold a Cardinal of the Romiſh Church, ſpeaks as plainly againſt the Council of *Trent*, as any whom they nickname Hereticks can.

The next Romiſh Author is *Nicolaus de Lira*, who gloſſing upon the ſame Chapter, ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe.

Si Populus intelligat orationem ſive benedictionem Sacerdotis, melius reducitur in Deum & devotius reſpondet, Amen.

If the People underſtand the Prayer or Thanksgiving which is performed by the Prieſt, their minds will be brought the better and nearer unto God, and with greater devoutneſs they will anſwer, Amen.

The third Romiſh Doctor, ſhall be the Angelical (as he is called) and highly-magnified *Thomas Aquinas*, *Commentar. in 1 Epiſtolam ad Corinth. cap.* 14. His words are theſe;

Plus lucratur qui orat & intelligit; nam reficitur, & quantum ad intellectum, & quantum ad affectum.

He gains moſt who prays and underſtands the words which he ſpeaks; for he is edified both as to his underſtanding, and alſo as to his affections.

Again he ſaith, *Melius eſt ut linguæ quæ benedicit, etiam interpretetur, omnis enim ſermo bonus eſt ad ædificationem fidei.*

'Tis beſt that the Tongue which bleſſes, ſhould interpret, for good words ſhould be ſpoken to the edification of faith.

Here we may with reaſon ſay, *Bene quidem ſcripſiſti Thomâ.*

Thomas thou haſt written what is agreeable to Truth.

Thus the Fathers and the Popiſh Doctors themſelves have deliver'd their opinions, and all are for praying in a known Language.

Nay I have read, and 'tis acknowledged by a Jeſuit, *Azorius Inſt. lib.* 8. *cap.* 26. *ex Ann. Sylv.* That above ſix hundred years ago, when the Pope did deliberate and conſult whether he ſhould grant unto the *Bohemians* the uſe of the Vulgar Tongue in their publick Devotions; there was heard a voice from Heaven, ſaying, *Omnis lingua confiteatur ei; Let every tongue confeſs unto God.*

But now at laſt let us be determined by the Apoſtle *Paul*, the ſuppoſed Preſident of the Council, and his mind I ſhall give you in this Paraphraſe upon his own words.

I thank my God I ſpeak with Tongues more than you all; but I had rather ſpeak five words to be underſtood by, and to edifie thoſe that hear me,

than

than ten thousand words in an unknown Tongue. If the Trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battel? and if I pray, and those that are present understand not the meaning of the voice, how shall they wrestle with God? how shall they defend themselves against the assaults of the evil one? how shall they join in begging for Grace to overcome him? I am an Apostle, and not a Barbarian, and I would not speak words into the air, but so as to benefit them that hear me. I am unwilling the Publick Worship of God should be exposed to the contempt and scorn of Infidels; or that they should censure it to be only the raving of mad-men, because they know not the meaning of the words that are used. Our God is not the God of confusion, but requires a reasonable Service, and these commands concerning Prayer and Praising so as to be understood, are his commands. Every one who is indeed spiritual will be thus perswaded: they who are otherwise minded are willingly ignorant.

You see I have proved the Protestant Doctrine out of the Fathers; nay, 'tis granted by Popish Authors of very great name; and how plainly the Apostle is on our side, do but read and judg.

Let the Papists now for shame cease their bragging of Antiquity. 'Twas certainly the manner of the elder and purer times to pray in a known Language. Thus prayed the Apostles, thus prayed our Lord Jesus, thus praised the Heavenly Host at Christs Nativity, in such words as the very Shepherds understood, *Glory be to God in the Highest, on Earth peace, good-will towards men.* Thus the Prophets prayed, and *David* the sweet-Singer of *Israel*; all his Psalms were written in *Hebrew*, the *Jews* Mother-tongue. Thus sung *Deborah* and *Barak*, thus *Moses* and the *Israelites* after their Miraculous Deliverance out of *Egypt*, and *Pharaohs* overthrow in the mighty Waters. Nay I must add, there was a time when there was but one Language in the whole World; before the building of *Babel*, and then there was no unknown Tongue to pray in. In the days of *Enos* the Son of *Seth* the Grand-child of *Adam*, 'tis said, *Men began to call upon the Name of the Lord*, Gen. 4. 26. And this must of necessity have been done in a Language which none were ignorant of. Surely then the Protestant Religion in this regard must be acknowledged of sufficient Antiquity, since 'tis as old as the old World, since 'twas before the flood of *Noah*.

In the fourth place I shall answer the Popish Arguments to defend their Cause; and shall not fear to produce the very strongest which I have met withal.

1. 'Tis Objected, That the Apostle does not speak in 1 *Cor.* 14. concerning the ordinary Divine Service, but concerning Spiritual Songs, which by an extraordinary Gift were utter'd:

Ans. The Apostle does mention Prayer as well as giving of Thanks; and there is as much reason that the ordinary Service should be understood, as the extraordinary; because that which is ordinarily used, should by all means be to Edification.

2. 'Tis

2. 'Tis Objected, That Prayer in an unknown Tongue is not condemned, but Prayer in a known Tongue only preferred. *Bellar.* Lib. 2. de Verbo Dei, Capit. 16.

Answ. First, Suppose this, why does the Church of *Rome* pray after the worse, and not after the better manner of the two? *Secondly*, I say 'tis condemned by the Apostle as not being for Edification; for he that could speak in a Tongue, if he could not interpret, nor any Interpreter present, *was commanded to keep silence in the Assembly.*

3. 'Tis Objected, That of old the Instruction and Edification of the People was necessary, and the use of Prayer was, that they might be instructed and Edified: But now the end of Prayer is not so much the Peoples Instruction and Edification, as the yielding to God that Worship which is due to him. Id. ibid.

Answ. First, The Apostles were as careful that God might have his Worship, as the Papists, nay a great deal more careful. Secondly, Disjoin not Gods Worship and the Peoples Edification; for he is best Worshipped *in spirit and in truth.* And the more the mind understands, and the heart of the Worshipper is affected, God is the more honoured, and the better pleased.

4. 'Tis Objected, That Prayer is not made to the People but unto God, and he understands all Tongues alike; and 'tis sufficient that the Lord understands what is prayed, though the People are ignorant. And this *Bellarmine* does illustrate by a similitude. If a Courtier, says he, should petition for a Country-man in *Latin* to a King, the Country-man might be benefited by the *Latin* Petition of the Courtier, though he should not understand a word of it. Loco citato.

Answ. 1. It might have been said, That God understands all Tongues alike in the Apostles days as well as now; the Lord being then and now, and always, equally Omniscient. 2. The use of Prayer is not to inform the God we pray to, *For he knows what things we have need of before we ask*, Mat. 6. 8. but to make our selves more sensible of our needs, and consequently more meet to be supplied; but how can this be if Prayer be lockt up in an unknown Dialect? 3. As for *Bellarmines* Similitude, it will not hold. For the God of Heaven is not like the Kings on Earth, who will hear Petitions made by Favourites for persons that make no address themselves: But He requires, That every particular person should ask if he will receive, and understand what he prays for; and that he should have suitable affections to the matter of his Petitions, if he will be heard and answered. Add also, That if a King should forbid Petitions in a strange Language, and should command that Petitioners should use a Tongue they understand, that with the greater earnestness they may beg what they need; to such an one a *Latin* Petition would not be so acceptable; But God has forbid the use of an unknown Tongue: Therefore we may conclude, That the Popish *Latin* Prayers in an Auditory which understand them not, are to very little purpose. The *People must seek and knock* as well as the Priest, else

they

they shall not find, else it *will not be opened unto them*, Mat. 7. 7.

In the fifth place I am to discover the tendency of, and Mystery of Iniquity in this Papal Doctrine, which encourages to Prayer in an unknown Tongue, and teaches People to be contented with an ignorant Devotion.

1. It gratifies exceedingly the lazy disposition of Men, who naturally like a liberty to rest *in opere operato*, in the work done, and cannot endure to be urged to the more difficult part of Religion, which lies in a conflict with wandring thoughts in duty; in watching over, and taking pains with the heart, that it may be intent, considerate and affectionate in its applications unto God. I know the Papists boast of their austerities in their Devotions; but these are external things, and who has required them at their hands? And I may with good reason affirm, That one quarter of an hour spent in Prayer, where the very heart is engaged, and understands what 'tis doing, and seeks the Lord with its whole desire, will be to better purpose than all the Prayers by rote that are, or can be said by a blind Papist, though he should live to the age of *Methuselah*.

2. This Doctrine is a notable device to keep the People ignorant, and to make them more dependent upon the Priesthood; and hereby they hope more easily to rule them. These cruel Guides, as they take away the Bible from the People, which is the great means of Knowledg; so they will not suffer them to cry for Knowledg, so as to know what they cry. What a faithful servant is the Pope unto the Prince of Darkness! and what quiet possession does the strong man armed keep while the Gospel is hid, and men pray for they know not what, and consequently obtain nothing!

3. Many Prayers may well be made in *Latin* meerly through shame. When I read the Scripture, I conclude the Papists are afraid of the Light which shines from thence, lest it overthrow their black Kingdom; and when I read the foolish, nay blasphemous Prayers, which are made in the Church of *Rome*, I conclude they are ashamed the meaning of them should be known. Thus they pray to the Virgin *Mary*.

Sancta Maria,	O Saint *Mary*,
Quæ totum orbem illuminas.	*Who dost enlighten the whole world.*
Quæ tuos servientes exaltas.	*Who dost exalt thy servants.*
Illuminatrix cordium.	*Who dost illuminate hearts.*
Fons misericordiæ.	*Who art the fountain of mercy.*
Ab omni malo libera nos Domina.	*From all evil good Lady deliver us.*

To Saint *Dorothy* they pray thus:

Sancta Dorothea,	*O holy* Dorothy,
Cor mundum in me crea.	*A clean heart create in me.*

Saint

Saint *Agnes* is prayed unto *to keep them in the Faith*; and Saint *George to save them from their Sins, that they may rest in Heaven with the Blessed for ever.* These *Latin* Prayers in plain *English* are most wicked Blasphemies; and both Gods work and honour, which is peculiar to himself, and dear to him, is (to the provoking of him to jealousie) ascribed and imparted to the Creature.

In the last place I come to the Application.

USE I.

Bless the Lord that the Day-spring from on high hath visited this Land of your Nativity, and that Popish darkness is so much dispelled. How thankful were the *Israelites*, think you, for that Light which shined so clear in *Goshen*, when *Egypt* was plagued with Darkness, that was so hideous and palpable? Neighbouring Regions, most of them are blinded by *Rome* and Hell; and see not the things which you see, hear not the things which you hear. You are instructed to whom Prayer is be directed, unto God; and in whose Name, in the Name of Christ, whose Mediation and Intercession is always prevalent. Supplications are made in a Tongue which you understand; that you may be the more affected with what you pray for, and consequently have gracious returns to your Prayers from the God of all Grace. What cause is here of Thanksgiving that Publick Administrations are so much more agreeable unto Christs Institution, than the Administrations of the Church of *Rome*.

Prayers being poured forth with so much fervency, and in such words as all, even the meanest, understand; the Scriptures being read in a Language which you know, so as that the Book of God is not a sealed Book to you; Sermons being preached with so much plainness and power. Finally, Sacraments being administred, so as that you may know how to improve these Seals of the New Covenant, to the strengthning of your Faith, the inflaming of your Love, and the increase of all manner of Grace: All this may well cause you to cry out with *David*, Psal. 84.1. *How amiable are thy Tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts.* And *one thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his Temple*, Psal. 27.4.

USE II.

It highly concerns you to fear and to pray against the return of Popish blindness. While Satan and his Angels are busie and industrious to extinguish the light of the Word, while *Rome* does join with Hell to this end, that this Land may be again overspread with Ignorance, Idolatry, Superstition, Will-Worship; 'tis your wisdom and duty, while they are plotting, to be counterworking by your Prayers. Oh cry unto the Lord to secure his own Honour, and your Priviledges, against these Enemies, which are so great invaders of both. Beg with the greatest

earneſtneſs, (and truly earneſt begging was never yet denied) that the Goſpel may continue, and a Spiritual way of Worſhip according to the direction of the Goſpel; and that *Romes* Emiſſaries may never make Merchandize of your Souls, or the Souls of your Poſterity.

USE III.

Let the blind zeal of the Papiſts make you more frequent in your acceſſes to the Throne of Grace: Though they Worſhip ignorantly, yet how much do they Worſhip? as Superſtition is wont to urge men to abundant labour. But you that ſee more reaſon to pray than they, and have more encouragement from God, than ever they underſtood, ſhould be ſhamed and quickned unto this Duty. The Papiſts indeed, if they underſtood themſelves, might well be diſheartned, becauſe their Worſhip is Will-worſhip, not of Gods appointment, but their own Invention. But you ſhould abound in Devotion, for God will not be ſought in vain as long as you ſeek him in his own way, and *your labour ſhall not be in vain in the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 58.

USE IV.

Take heed of Diſtraction in Prayer, and not-minding what you ask or what you are doing, when at the Mercy-Seat. 'Tis great hypocriſie to be preſent only in body at the Sanctuary; the heart in the mean while running away after pleaſures, covetouſneſs, vanity; and this exceedingly provokes the Lord to jealouſie, *and are you ſtronger than He?* 1 *Cor.* 10. 22. Pray, what's the difference between a *Papiſt that underſtands not*, and a *carnal Proteſtant that minds not* a word of what is ſpoken in Prayer? Or if there be any difference the Proteſtant is in the worſe caſe; becauſe having the means of Edification, he is the more without Apology, that he is not edified.

USE V.

Content not your ſelves with bare underſtanding the words of Prayer, but know the Lord you pray to; be acquainted with his Power and Truth, and how he keeps Mercy for thouſands, and particularly for you, if you are ſenſible of your ſin and miſery, and are willing that from both He ſhould deliver you. Underſtand alſo the worth of what you ask, that Spiritual and Eternal Bleſſings being highly valued, your deſires after them may be vehement, and you may wreſtle with the greater ſtrength and reſolution till you have obtain'd them.

USE VI.

Let Underſtanding and Faith in this duty of Prayer be join'd together. The Popiſh implicite Faith, to believe as the Church believes, that is, to believe they know not what, is a wretched piece of careleſneſs and preſumption, and a mad venturing of the Soul, which is ſo precious, upon an empty ſound and title. But do you ſearch the Scriptures, enquire what God has ſpoken; and firmly believe his words which are ſo faithful and worthy of all acceptation. Let your Faith in Prayer be ſtrong; and be fully perſwaded, that having ſuch Promiſes as God has made, and

engaged

engaged himſelf to make good, and ſuch an Advocate in Heaven as Chriſt the Righteous; what you ask according to the Will of God ſhall in no wiſe be denied. In a word know your duty and do it, and then conclude, As certainly as *God is*, ſo certainly *he will be a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him*, Heb. 11. 6.

Thomas Mortonus Epiſc. *Dunelm.* Apol. Cathol. Par. 2. Lib. 1. Cap. 31. De Vernac. precibus, pag. 108. *Non eſt igitur quod in hâc cauſâ, lector, hallucineris; neq; enim te fugit nos primo antiquitatem novitati: Secundo, devotionem ſanctam & divinam, cæcæ & fanaticæ ſuperſtitioni: Tertio, animæ conſolationem ſpiritualem, rigidæ ſtupiditati: Quarto, infantiæ prudentiam: Quinto, torpori conſenſum: Sexto, fictis & ementitis periculis commoda pene infinita: Septimo, ſacroſanctam deniq; Spiritus ſancti ſapientiam, humanæ ſtultitiæ ac temeritati anteponere.*

There is therefore, Reader, no room for a miſtake in this cauſe, for thou canſt not but know, that the Proteſtants prefer, 1. Antiquity before Novelty: 2. Holy and divine Devotion before blind (and properly ſo called) fanatick Superſtition: 3. The ſpiritual comfort of the Soul, before rigid ſtupidity: 4. Prudence before childiſhneſs: 5. Conſent before careleſneſs: 6. Almoſt infinite advantages before feigned and imaginary dangers: 7. The holy wiſdom of the Spirit of God, before the folly and raſhneſs of man.

SERMON X.

The Testimony of the Church is not the only, nor the chief reason, of our believing the Scripture to be the Word of God.

LUKE 16. 29.

They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them.

AS everlasting Blessedness (mens greatest and most desirable Good) is that which God only can bestow, and the Way to it that which He only can discover: (Who knows the Lords mind like himself? Who is so sure a Guide in the Way, as He who is himself the End? Nature can neither direct us to, nor fit us for a Supernatural Happiness.) So it is not only our interest to seek it, but likewise to see, Whether what pretends to be the Rule of our walking, in order to our obtaining of it, be indeed the right one; which we can no otherwise be assured of, than by seeing that it be such a one as is given us by him to whom alone it belongs to prescribe us the Way, and who being infinitely good, as well as infinitely wise, will no more deceive us, than he can be himself deceived. Now the holy Scripture of the Old, and New Testament, is that which we profess to own as the Rule of our Faith and Life, in relation to our future Glory. It is then the wisdom of every Christian to enquire upon what account he receives this Rule, why he believes it, and submits to it, whether he be perswaded that it is of God, by God himself, or only by men; for if he can find indeed that he receives it upon the Authority of God, he may be secure of the Truth, and Sufficiency of it; but if only on that of Men, they being liable to mistakes,

miſtakes may lead him into Error, and ſo he can never be ſure that what he owns as his Rule, is indeed the right one, and of Gods own preſcribing: Or admit it really be ſo, yet if it be not received on right grounds, he will be expoſed to innumerable fears, and fluctuations, and never walk comfortably, nor conſtantly in his way, when he doubts whether it be the right, or a wrong one: The ſuperſtructure cannot be better than the foundation; and a well-ordered and comfortable Converſation will never be the effect of an ill-grounded Belief. It is good therefore in the beginning of our Courſe to be ſecure of our way, to ſee both what we believe, and why; leſt otherwiſe, we be either forced to go back, or elſe upon as light grounds ſwerve from the way, as we were at firſt perſwaded to engage in it. Our great enquiry then in this Diſcourſe will be, *Upon what account we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God? whether upon the Authority of God, or the Church?* which I ground upon theſe words, *They have Moſes and the Prophets, let them hear them.*

In this Parable, whereof theſe words are a part, we have an account of the different eſtates of a wicked man *Dives*, and a good man *Lazarus*, both in this life, and the other. In this life *Dives* had *his good things*, the whole of his happineſs, all the portion he was ever to enjoy; and *Lazarus* had *his evil things*, all the ſorrow and miſery he was ever to endure. And in the other life, we have *Lazarus* in *Abrahams Boſom*, a place and ſtate of reſt, *entered into peace*; and *Dives* in *Hell*, a ſtate of miſery, and place of torments; where finding ſo great a change, and being deeply affected with his now woful condition, he is (though in vain) deſirous, if not of releaſe, as deſpairing of that, yet at leaſt of a little eaſe; and therefore addreſſing himſelf to *Abraham*, he entreats him that *Lazarus* might be ſent *to dip* but even *the tip of his finger in water, and cool his Tongue*; but this is denied him as impoſſible, *ver.* 26. Seeing that would not do, he deſires, however, his torments might not be encreaſed by his Brethrens coming to him, whom we may ſuppoſe to have been his fellow-ſinners, and partakers with him in his riot, and luxury: Or, if you will believe ſo much charity to be among the Damned, his requeſt is, That *Lazarus* might be ſent to them to admoniſh them for their good, that ſo they might be brought to a timely Repentance, e're they came to an untimely end, and then to endleſs torments. But this is denied him too as altogether needleſs, and unprofitable, *ver.* 35; and he is told, That God had made ſufficient Proviſion for them, given them the moſt effectual means, whereby they might be brought to Repentance, in that he had given them his Written Word, *Moſes and the Prophets*, by whoſe Writings if they were not perſwaded to Repent, a Miracle would not perſwade them; *Lazarus* riſing from the Dead would no more be believed, than *Moſes* and the Prophets, whoſe Writings were among them; and therefore to them *Abraham* ſends them as a means ſufficient for the end, pretended at leaſt by *Dives* to be aimed at. *They have Moſes* Iſa. 57. 1.

and

and the Prophets, let them hear them; As if he had ſaid, The Will of God concerning thy Brethrens duty, and the Truth of God concerning future rewards as the great motives to it, are clearly enough laid down in the Scripture; and if they believe not theſe things, and are not perſwaded to Repentance upon the Authority of God in his Word, much leſs will they be moved by the Teſtimony of one coming from the Dead. Hence I infer, *That the Holy Scripture, or Written Word of God, is ſufficient in it ſelf, and moſt effectually able to convince men of the truth of thoſe things which are contained in it.* It was ſo then, why not now? *Moſes* and the Prophets were ſo, why are not the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts? is all the whole Scripture grown *Old* Teſtament, and ſo *old* as to be *decayed*? when, and by what means did it loſe that Life and Power, that Authority and Efficacy it ſometimes had? it had formerly more virtue to convince men than a Miracle it ſelf, and now belike it hath leſs than a Council! it could have done more than a *man from the dead*, and now it can do leſs than *a dead man*, a ſinful Pope! (for his Holineſs of *Rome* may be very wicked, the Papiſts themſelves being Judges).

From the former Propoſition it will undeniably follow, *That the Scripture is ſufficient in it ſelf to convince men of its own Divineneſs, or its being it ſelf the Word of God, that being one truth it doth ſo often aſſert:* The General muſt comprehend the Particular, and therefore if the Scripture be ſufficient to ſatisfie the minds of men as to all that it affirms to be truth, it muſt needs be able to ſatisfie them as to this too, that the whole of it is the Word of God.

But this our Adverſaries will not allow, and therefore inſtead of taking it for granted, or reſting on this ſingle proof, we muſt here put it to the Queſtion, *From whence the Scripture hath its Authority? or upon what grounds we are to believe it to be the Word of God?* If you will give the Papiſts leave to anſwer, they will preſently tell you, *Upon the ſole Authority of the Church*, or, *becauſe the Church declares it to be the Word of God*, and *that without the determination of the Church, it hath very little Authority, or weight in it*, and you are *no more bound to believe the Goſpel of* Mathew, *than the Hiſtory of* Livy; Nay, one ſays plainly, That *but for the Church, you are no more bound to believe the Scripture than* Eſops *Fables*; and you may be ſure the Man was in earneſt, when you do but conſider how many incredible things another of them (alledged at large by our learned *Whitaker*) muſters up out of the Scripture, which he would fain perſwade the World would never be believed, if the Church did not interpoſe her Teſtimony; and yet as broad as the Blaſphemy mentioned is, another of the ſame Party minceth the Matter, and ſays, the Words might be *piouſly ſpoken*: And if a private Doctor of the Church of *Rome* may thus tranſubſtantiate Blaſphemy into Piety, or make that paſs for *Pious*, which is really *Blaſphemous*, I ſee no reaſon why a Pope might not add his Authority, and make it *Canonical* too. But that we may give the beſt Account of the Controverſie before us:

Surdiſ. apud Chamier.

1. Something

1. Some things muſt be premiſed by way of Explication, for the better underſtanding of Terms.
2. The State of the Queſtion muſt be laid down.
3. The Truth confirmed.
4. Popiſh Objections anſwered.
5. Some Application made.

1. For Explication of Terms, let us ſee,

1. What we mean by the *Scripture*. By that therefore is underſtood the Word of God, declaring his mind concerning mens Happineſs and Duty, or teaching us what we are to believe concerning God, and how we are to obey him, as it was at firſt revealed by himſelf to the Apoſtles and Prophets, and by them delivered by word of mouth, and afterward for the perpetuity and uſefulneſs of it, committed to Writing as we now have it, in the Books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*: So that *the Word of God*, and *the Scripture* are the ſame materially, and differ only in this, That the *Word of God* doth not in it ſelf imply its being written, nor exclude it, but may be conſidered indifferently as to either; whereas *the Scripture* ſignifies the ſame Word, only with the addition of its being committed to Writing.

2. What is meant by *Authority*, when we enquire, whence the Scripture hath its Authority. Authority in this Buſineſs is a Power of Commanding or Perſwading, or (as ſome phraſe it) Convincing, ariſing from ſome Excellency in the Thing or Perſon veſted with ſuch Authority. Whatever hath Authority *de facto*, ſo far forth hath eſteem and honour, or reverence yielded to it, as whatever hath Authority *de jure* hath ſuch eſteem or honour of due belonging to it, and anſwering it as its correlate; and both the one and the other is founded on ſome Excellency, ſometimes of Nature (both in Perſons and Things,) ſometimes of Office and Dignity, ſometimes of Knowledg, ſometimes of Vertue and Manners, ſometimes of Prudence (as in Perſons;) according to each of which a ſuitable reſpect and honour is due to the Authority therefrom ariſing; and as any Man excels in any of theſe, ſo he hath Authority in that, though he may not in other Things. Thus he that excels in the knowledg of the *Law*, may have Authority in that, though he may have none in *Phyſick* or *Divinity*, in which he may not *excel*: and an honeſt Man, that *excels* in Morality, may on that account have the Authority of a *Witneſs*, though not of a *Judg*. Now when we ſpeak of the Authority of the Scripture and ask from whence it hath it? we do but enquire, Whence it is, that the Scripture perſwades, convinces, or binds us to believe it, or commands us to aſſent to it, as the Word God? or whereon its Power of ſo doing is founded? whether it be not ſome Excellency inherent in it ſelf, or whether it be only ſomething forrein and extrinſecal to it? *Camero de Verbo Dei.*

3. What we mean by Faith, when it is demanded, Why we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God? Faith, ſo far as it concerns the underſtanding

underſtanding (for in ſome Acts of Faith the Will bears part) is an aſſent yielded to ſomething propoſed under the appearance (at leaſt) of Truth, built upon the Teſtimony of another; and therefore according as the Teſtimony is, for the ſake of which we believe any thing, accordingly will our Faith be: If it be the Teſtimony of a Man or Men, our Faith will be an humane Faith; but if the Teſtimony be Divine, or we believe a thing becauſe God himſelf aſſerts it, we call it a Divine Faith. Only we muſt remember, that a truly Divine Faith hath always God for its Author; ſo that three things concur to the producing the Act of ſuch a Faith. 1. The Truth believed, which is the Object of it. 2. The Teſtimony of God concerng that Truth, which is the Formal Reaſon, and Ground of this Faith. 3. The Efficiency of God producing it, or working it in the Mind. Now when we ſpeak of *believing* the Scripture to be the Word of God, we ſpeak of a Divine Faith: A man may upon the Credit of his Parents, of his Miniſter, of a particular Church, or of the Church Catholick (if ſuch a Teſtimony can be had) believe the Scripture to be the Word of God; but the queſtion will be, what kind of Faith that is, whether ſuch a one as God requires him to receive the Scripture with?

Objectum materiale.

Objectum formale.

4. What we underſtand by the Church in the Queſtion: The Church may be taken either for the Univerſality of Believers in all places of the World, ſo as to comprehend private Saints, as well as publick Officers, People as well as Paſtors, and thoſe of former ages as well as the preſent, Prophets themſelves, and Apoſtles, and Pen-men of the Scripture; or we may take it for that part of the Catholick Church which lives together in the ſame age call, it if you pleaſe the preſent Catholick Church, comprehending in it all the Believers, People as well as Paſtors, alive at the ſame time, in the ſeveral parts of the whole World. Or elſe, we may underſtand the Church in the Popiſh ſenſe, only for the preſent Church; and that too, for the Church of *Rome*, which they call Catholick; and that again, only for the Paſtors of it, excluding the People; and they again may be conſidered either ſeparately, or in conjunction, as meeting together in a General Council; and that either by themſelves without the Pope, or together with him: Or laſtly as repreſented by him, or *virtually* contained in him; for this great name *the Church*, dwindles at laſt into one only man: But ſure he is no ſmall one that contains ſo many in him; for if we believe the Papiſts (not only, though eſpecially the Jeſuits) the Pope, in this Controverſie, is nothing elſe but the Church Catholick compacted, and thruſt into a ſingle perſon, in whom all thoſe ſeveral Excellencies, which are ſcatter'd among the Members, do, as in the Head, *collectively* reſide. And ſo the Catholickneſs they vaunt ſo much of, is crowded into a narrow compaſs, for thoſe whether Paſtors or Members of the Church that lived formerly are firſt cut off, and the Church is reduced to the preſent age; then the people (as excreſcencies) are pared away too, and the bulkineſs of the Church thereby leſſened,

ſened, the Officers or Paſtors only remaining; and yet theſe too muſt be contracted into a Council, and that at laſt Epitomized into a Pope, who is but the Epitome of an Epitome, and ſcarce ſo much as a *ſmall Synopſis* of that *Voluminous* thing, *the Church*, they talk ſo *largely* of.

2. For the ſtate of the Queſtion, theſe things being premiſed, take it thus; In ſome things we agree with them, in ſome we differ from them.

1. In ſome we agree:

1. That the Scripture of the Old and New Teſtament, which we own (who yet exclude the Apocryphal Books of one ſort, or other), *is the Word of God*, is acknowledged by them, as well as by us.

2. Conſequently, That it is *in it ſelf true and of Divine Authority*, and that it doth not depend upon the Church as to that Authority and Truth which *in it ſelf* it hath, or that the Teſtimony of the Church doth not make it to be *true*, or to be *the Word of God*; the Papiſts themſelves (at leaſt the moſt wary among them) will (be ſure in words) grant: and therefore they have coyned a diſtinction for the nonce; they tell us, That the Scripture hath a twofold Authority, one *in it ſelf*, as it is true, and comes from God; the other *in relation to us*, as it binds us to receive, and believe it: The former of theſe they own to be in the Scripture, Antecedently to the Teſtimony of the Church. The diſtinction is vain, when all Authority is in relation to another, over whom either *de facto* it is, or *de jure* it ought to be exerciſed. But let it paſs.

3. That every Chriſtian is bound with a Divine Faith to receive the Scripture as the Word of God, they grant as well as we do.

4. That the holy Spirit hath a hand in mens believing the Scripture to be the Word of God, allow the Papiſts their ſence, and they will likewiſe yield no leſs than we. That the Faith whereby men own the Scriptures, (if it be a Divine one, as they ſay it is), is wrought in the hearts of men by the Spirit of God, they do grant, and muſt, unleſs they will avow themſelves to be *Pelagians*.

5. And laſtly, That the Church allow us our ſenſe, may be an help to us, and furtherance to our Faith in receiving the Scripture, as the Word of God, we will grant as well as they. That the Univerſal Concurrence of all Believers in receiving the Scripture, and the Teſtimony they do, and in all ages have, in their way and capacity given to it, is a ſtrong Argument to perſwade diſſenters to ſubmit to the Divine Authority of it, we eaſily yield. And that it is the duty of the preſent Church, during its time, to labour to preſerve the Scripture pure and intire, and to hold it forth to others, and endeavour to perſwade them of its Divineneſs, and ſo to perform the part of a Teacher, we are willing likewiſe to yield. And ſo in a word we acknowledg the uſefulneſs of the Churches Teſtimony, as an external help, and that by which ſome benefit may be reaped by men at the beginning of their Faith; for it is the foundation of an humane Faith, and ſufficient for the producing of

that: And when a man hath so far yielded, as to receive the Scripture as Gods Word, though only on the credit of Men, yet coming afterward to peruse and study it, and look more narrowly into it, he may then come to see better, and more solid grounds for his belief, and God working on his heart by the Word, he may come to receive it with a Divine Faith, which at first he did only with an humane: As *Joh.* 4. the men of *Samaria* who first believed Christ for the *Womans words*, did afterwards believe him, *because they heard himself.* Thus far therefore there is some agreement between them and us. So that the Question is not concerning the *Object* of our Faith, the thing to be believed, for both acknowledg it (in this business) to be the Divineness of the Scripture; nor concerning the *Efficient cause* of that Faith, for both will own it to be the Spirit which works this Faith in the heart: But concerning *the Medium, or Argument whereby the Spirit works it, and so the ground and foundation of our Faith, that which is the formal reason why we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God.*

2. This therefore is *the thing wherein we and they differ*; something they affirm which we deny, and something we affirm which they deny.

1. They affirm *the Testimony of the present Church*, (and that must be of *Rome* only now; for they count that only the Catholick one, *that is of the Pastors of it convened in a General Council, either with the Pope*, (as some of them say) *or without him* (as others) *or virtually in him* (as others) *to be the only sufficient ground of mens believing the Scripture to be the Word of God*; and so tell us, *That the Spirit bears witness to the Divinity of the Scripture by the Testimony of the Church, and makes use of that as the Medium, or Argument by which he perswades men to receive the Scripture as the Word of God, and that without that Testimony or Antecedently to it, men cannot know, nor are bound to believe the Scripture so to be.* This we deny.

2. We affirm on the other side, *That the Testimony of the Spirit of God in the Word it self, witnessing it to be of God, by that stamp and impress, or* (which comes to the same) *by those notes and marks of Divinity which every-where appear in it, is the immediate and principal, and a sufficient reason of our believing it to be the Word of God, and the Medium the Spirit useth in working Faith in us, or making us assent to the Divinity of the Scripture.* So that as the Spirit working inwardly in our hearts, moves as the *Efficient* of our Faith; so the Scripture it self in its own intrinsecal beauty, lustre, power and excellency, is that which moves us in the way of an *Object*, or *Medium*, to yield our assent to its being of God. By this the Spirit of God as the Author of the Scripture witnesseth it to be of God, and by an internal application of this to our minds, induceth us to assent to its so being. The Testimony of the Spirit in the Word is open, publick, general to all, if they have but eyes to see it, whereas the inward application of it by the Efficiency of the Spirit is only to Believers.

This

This they deny; and this we shall first (though more briefly) prove, and then disprove (as well as we deny) what they assert.

Arg. 1. The Holy Ghost in Scripture calls us to the Scripture it self, and Gods Authority only in it, (and not to the Church) for the setling of our belief of its Divinity; and therefore in the Scripture it self we have a sufficient Argument to move us to believe its coming from God, *Isa.* 8. 20. we are sent *to the Law and to the Testimony*, the Prophets generally propound what they deliver, meerly in the name, and on the authority of God; their usual stile is, *Thus saith the Lord*, and, *The word of the Lord*; they do no-where send us to the Church to know, Whether it be so, or not, but leave it with us as being of it self (that is, without the Testimony of the Church) sufficient to convince us, and if we will not believe it, at our own peril be it. So in the Text, *Abraham* (that is indeed Christ, whose mind *Abraham* in this Parable is brought in speaking,) sends *Dives* Brethren to *Moses and the Prophets*; and our Saviour Christ, *Joh.* 5. 39. sends the *Jews* to the *Scriptures*, bids them *search them*, and so *ver.* 46, 47; and *Luke Act.* 17. 11. commends the *Bereans*, not that they sent up to *Jerusalem* to the Church there, or waited for a General Council to assure them of the Divineness of what was preached to them, but that *they daily searched the Scriptures, to see if those things were so.* But all this would be in vain, our labour would be lost in searching the Scriptures, and looking into them for the confirmation of themselves, if there were not something in them sufficient to perswade us of their having God for their Author, but at last we must have recourse to the Church to assure us of it. Why are we sent thus far about, if a nearer way be at hand?

Arg. 2. Those Properties which the Holy Ghost in the Scripture attributes to the Scripture will prove the same. It is *light*, *Prov.* 6. 23. *The Commandment is a lamp, and the Law is light.* Psal. 119. 105. *A lamp to my feet, and a light to my path: A light shining in a dark place*, 2 Pet. 1. 19. and sure that which is light may discover it self. He that needs another to tell him what is light, wants eyes. *Heb.* 4. 12. *It is quick and powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword*, it *enters* into the Soul, and therefore by its own power and efficacy discovers it self to us as well as us to our selves. It is *like as a fire, and like a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces*, *Jer.* 23. 29. So likewise, 1 *Cor.* 14. 24, 25. and *Psal.* 19. 7, 8. From both which we may argue, That Word which *convinceth* men, *judgeth* them, makes *manifest the secrets* of their *hearts*; that again, *which converts the soul, makes wise the simple, rejoiceth the heart, enlightens the eyes*, is sufficiently able to discover it self to be of God, though the Church should not give in her Testimony; but such a Word is the Scripture: therefore, &c. And further, Why may not Gods Word discover its Author, as well as his Works do? If *the Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament shews his handy work*, Psal. 19. 1. If even the least Creatures preach God to us, they that bear not his Image on them, yet have some *vestigia*, some

Præsentem clamat quælibet herba Deum.

ſome ſootſteps of him, and much more his greater and more noble Works, the Glorious Fabrick of Heaven and Earth, and Man the moſt excellent of his Creatures on Earth, ſhew forth that Excellency in them, which manifeſts it ſelf to be from none but God; and he hath in a word, left ſuch an impreſs of Himſelf upon his Works, as that they generally proclaim themſelves to be his. Why ſhould it be thought incredible, that God ſhould leave the like notices of Himſelf upon his Word, and ſtamp that upon it which might plainly evidence it to be his? Nay, if Men do commonly make themſelves known by their Works, Writers by their Skill, Artiſts by their curious Pieces; if *Apelles* could have drawn ſuch a Picture, *Phidias* have cut ſuch a Statue, *Cicero* have pen'd ſuch an Oration, that any who had judgment in ſuch things might have ſaid, Such a Man and no other, was the Author of ſuch a Work; ſurely then much more may God in ſo lively a manner expreſs Himſelf in his Word, as clearly to notifie to us, that it is his. And if any ſhould ſay, God could have done it, but would not; I deſire to know a good reaſon, Why God who hath left us ſo plain and conſpicuous Evidences of his Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs on his Creatures, *would* not leave the print of Himſelf in the like manner upon his Word?

Vid. Rob. Baron. cont. Turnebul.

Arg. 3. Gods revealing Himſelf to us in the Scripture is the firſt and higheſt Revelation upon which our Faith is built, and therefore that Revelation is ſufficient to manifeſt it ſelf to us, even without the Churches Teſtimony. The reaſon of the Conſequence is, Becauſe Faith (a Divine one ſuch as we ſpeak of) being always built upon Revelation, whatever it be which is the firſt Revelation whereon our Faith is built muſt be ſufficient to notifie it ſelf to us; otherwiſe our Faith is not founded upon any Revelation at all, if that Revelation needs ſomething elſe which is not Revelation to give credit to it: Or if that which is the firſt Revelation, yet needs another to make it manifeſt to us, it is not it ſelf the firſt, which is a palpable contradiction. And for the Antecedent, I thus make it appear: In the buſineſs of Faith, Either we muſt come to ſome firſt Revelation, or we muſt go on from one to another without any end: For either the Faith whereby I believe this Revelation, *That the Scripture is the Word of God*, to be Divine, is founded upon this very Revelation it ſelf, *viz.* the *Scripture*, (which ſo many times tells me it is of God), or upon ſome other Revelation; if upon this it ſelf, then I have what I would, that this is the firſt Revelation whereon my Faith is built: But if on another, I ask again, Muſt I believe that for it ſelf, or for ſome other; if for it ſelf, then that muſt be the firſt; if for ſome other, I ſhall ask again, Am I to believe that for it ſelf, or for another, and ſo there will be no end, no firſt Revelation on which my Faith is founded, but I muſt go higher, and higher, even *in infinitum*. Other Arguments might be produced to confirm what we aſſert, and are by our Divines, but I intended brevity in theſe, and the truth we maintain will be more confirmed by what I am in the next place to ſay againſt the Papiſts Aſſertion.

2. That

2. That therefore the *Teſtimony of the Church is not the only ſufficient ground*, (nor indeed a ſufficient one at all,) *of our believing the Divinity of the Scripture*, I ſhall prove by ſeveral Arguments.

Arg. 1: I argue from *Epheſ.* 2. 20. *And are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets.* The Scripture is the foundation of the Church, and therefore hath not its Authority, even *in reſpect of us*, from the Church, but on the contrary the Church hath its Authority from the Scripture, upon which it depends in its very being, and without which it is not the Church, nor if built upon any other foundation; it hath no Authority but from the Scripture, none in it ſelf but as thence it derives it, and we know none it hath but as there we find it. And this is ſpoken of the true Church, and not meerly the Church in the Popiſh ſenſe. If ever we would find out the nature and definition of the Church, we muſt ſeek it in the Scripture, where alone it is that we ſee it to be Gods Will to have a Church upon Earth, and by what means it is called, and of whom it is conſtituted, and with what Power and Priviledges it is endowed. He that will queſtion, Whether the Scripture be the Word of God will as eaſily queſtion, Whether the Church be the Church of God; or, Whether God have any Church or not. Now if the Church have all its Authority from the Scripture, by which alone it is a Church, and known to be ſo, how can it be with any reaſon ſaid, That the Scripture hath its Authority, even *as to us* from the Church? For if the Church have no Authority but from the Scripture, than the Authority of the Church muſt ſuppoſe that of the Scripture, and the Scripture muſt be own'd, or the Church cannot be own'd; for who knows what, or which the Church is, but as the Scripture deſcribes it to us? and ſo the Scripture hath not its Authority, *as to us*, from the Church. For can the Scripture both give Authority to the Church, and yet receive its own Authority from it? Can it authorize the Church before it be it ſelf authorized by it? Can it give the Church a Power to communicate Authority to it, and yet hath no Authority hitherto it ſelf? Nay, Can it be conſiſtent with common ſenſe, that the Scripture ſhould give the Church a Power to bind men to the belief of it, and yet have no Power in it ſelf to bind the Church to the belief of it? Again, when they ſay the Scripture hath its Authority from the Church, I ask, How ſhall I know there is a Church? for if I be one that own no ſuch thing as the Scripture (which the Church is perſwading me to believe) withal I own no ſuch Society as the Church, and how will they prove there is ſuch a one, but by the Scripture? for I who am ſuppoſed to acknowledg no Church, do acknowledg no Authority it hath, and ſhall not take its own Word: And yet if I grant there be a Church, How ſhall I know that ſuch a company of men as pretend to be the Church, are really ſo? I ſhall not take their own Teſtimony, I am not ſatisfied in their being witneſſes to themſelves: And if they will prove themſelves to be the Church by the Scripture, then either the Scripture muſt have

Autho-

Authority *as to me* before the Church, or else they prove one obscure thing by another. If they say there be certain signs and marks of the Church inherent in it, by which it may be known: Alas I know not those marks but by the Scripture which describes the Church. If they say the Spirit witnesseth by those marks that this is the Church, why may not I say the same of the Scripture, and so that be known without the Testimony of the Church to be the Word of God, as well as the Church to be the Church of God? And yet after all this, granting this Society of Men to be the Church, yet How shall I know that this Church is Infallible? and if I know it not to be so, I am not so mad as to build my Faith upon its Authority. If they say because it is governed by the Holy Ghost; How shall I know that? for it is not obvious to me that it is: If they say because Christ hath promised that it should; I ask, where? Where can it be but in the Scripture? sure then the Scripture must be owned, and have its Authority *as to me*, or their proof is invalid, and they do but trifle instead of arguing.

Before I proceed to another Argument, let us examine what is excepted against this. To this Text, *Eph.* 2. 20. It is replied by some of the Papists.

Excep. 1. 'That by *Foundation* is not meant the *Scripture written* by 'the *Apostles and Prophets*, but their Preaching,

Ans. But, 1. If that were granted, it would not prejudice our Cause; what they Writ and Preached is the same Truth, and differs not essentially, but only in the way of Delivery, one being delivered to their present Hearers *vivâ voce*, and the other by Writing transmitted likewise to Posterity. *Act.* 26. 22. *Witnessing, both to small and great, and saying no other things, than what the Prophets and* Moses *did say should come.* So *Act.* 17.

2. The Preaching of the Apostles and Prophets did last but a while, whereas *Paul* speaks of the lasting, perpetual Foundation of the Church.

3. If he speaks only of the Preaching of the Apostles and Prophets, How comes he to joyn these two together? for the Prophets were long since dead, and their Preaching (if that only were the Foundation of the Church) could be the Foundation of that Church only, which lived with them, and heard them.

Excep. 'He meant therefore, say some of our Adversaries, the *New-Te-'stament* Prophets, which Preached at the same time with the Apostles.

Ans. But that is not so easily proved, as said, for though such Prophets are mentioned in some places of the *New-Testament*, it doth not follow, That they must needs be understood here; for Why doth the Apostle mention them only, and not Evangelists too, nay Pastors and Teachers likewise, whom he joyns altogether. *Eph.* 4. and who did at the same time Preach the same Truth which the Apostles did? Besides that, we find by the Doctrine of the Prophets mentioned in the *New-Testament*,

Testament, the Truth Preached and Written by the Prophets under the *Old*, commonly understood. So *Pet.* 2. 1. 19. *A more sure Word of Prophecy. Heb.* 1. 1. *God spake to the Fathers by the Prophets.* So also, *Rom.* 1. 2. and *Luke* 1. 70. The Apostles under the *New-Testament*, were the Chief that Taught, though *New-Testament* Prophets, as likewise Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers did Preach the same Doctrine; as formerly under the *Old-Testament*, the Prophets that then lived were the Chief, though others besides, as the Levites, *Chron.* 2. 30. 22. did *Teach the good knowledg of the Lord.*

Excep. 'But, say they again, the *Ephesians* were not built upon *Pauls* 'Writings, which were not then extant, but on his Preaching; and 'therefore these other kind of Prophets must be understood, on whose 'Preaching (together with the Apostles) they were Built.

Ans. The Preaching the Truth or Writing it makes no difference, but still it is the same Truth, which is the foundation of the Church, whether it be Written or Preached. And though the *Ephesians* were built on the Word as *Preached* by *Paul*, yet What hinders, but they might likewise be Built on the Word, *as Written* by former Prophets, whom though they could not now hear, yet they might Read? And *Paul* himself proves what he *Preached* by what the Prophets had *Writ*, that so both the Word *Preached* and *Written* might be propounded to the *Ephesians* as one and the same Foundation of their Faith.

Excep. 2. 'They say, That by the Church in this Place is understood, 'not the Pastors, but the People, because the Pastors were they that 'Preached; and therefore if they were meant, it would follow, that 'they should be Built upon Themselves.

Ans. 1. It is most absurd to say, That the Pastors and Doctors of the Church are not Built upon the Doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets. Who ever heard of one Foundation for the Faith of the Teachers, & another for the Faith of the People? It seems then, by their own Confession, the Pope and his Clergy are not Built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and if they have not this Foundation, I am sure they have no better. The Faith of Pastors and People is the same; and why is not the Foundation the same too? Are they fit to Build up Others in the Faith of the Scriptures, who are not Themselves Built upon the Scriptures? And it is idle to say, they are Built on the Holy Spirit: for will they separate the Spirit from the Scripture? What doth the Spirit Teach but out of, and according to the Scripture? to be *Led by the Spirit*, and yet *Built on the Scriptures*, are very well consistent.

Arg. 2. It is not absurd to say, That the Teachers of the Church are Built on the Doctrine they Teach, though *Not as they Teach it*, yet *as They have* before *received & believed it:* Indeed they ought to offer nothing to Others as the Foundation of their Faith, but what is the Foundation of their Own: nor to hazard the Souls of their Hearers upon any worse Bottom,

than

than they would venture their own Souls. And it doth not follow, from hence, That they are taught by themselves, or are a Foundation to themselves, but only that the Doctrine they have themselves Believed and are Built upon, they deliver it to Others, that they too may believe it, and be Built upon it.

Arg. 2. The Doctrine delivered in the Scripture doth not, as to our receiving it, depend upon the Church, and therefore neither doth the Scripture it self: the Doctrine of the Scripture, and the Scripture it self, are really the same, and differ but in an accident of being Written, or not Written. The same Doctrines we have in the Scripture were published, and known before they were written, and they did not then depend upon the Authority of the Church, and why should they now? Doth the Writing of them make them of less Authority, or less credible, or less able to convince Mens minds than they formerly were? Upon the Authority of what Church did *Adam*, *Seth*, *Enoch*, *Abraham*, &c. receive the Word of God, when it was yet unwritten? What Council was there, what Pope to perswade them of it? And how come the same Truths to have less Power and Efficacy to perswade us, than them? Will our Adversaries say the Patriarchs received the Word immediately from God himself? True: some of them did; but what is that to the Church, and her Authority? Or will they say, those Patriarchs from whom others received the Word were Infallible? They will hardly be able to prove it. How came *Abraham* to perswade his Wife to tell a lie, and expose her Chastity thereby for the saving of his Life, if he were Infallible? And how came other Patriarchs to allow Polygamy if they were Infallible? And do not the Papists themselves tell us that the Church of the Jews was not Infallible, and that Infallibility is the peculiar Privileg of the Gospel-Church, the Promise of it being made only to that? And to come down lower, *Moses* received many Things of the Lord, which were immediately received by the People, as the Law of the Passover, *Exod.* 12. and 24. 3. where the People presently answer, That *All the words which the Lord* had said, they would *do*. Did the People themselves (the Church in the Wilderness, *Act.* 7. 18.) give Authority to these Laws, or did the Council of the Elders do it? We find nothing of their being convened together upon any such account, as to consider whether Gods Laws should be received or not: Or did they receive them on the Authority of any other Church? If so, which was it, where was it? Or lastly, was *Moses* an *Old-Testament* Pope, and the *Virtual Church* of *Israel*? Then by like that Church was Infallible as well as the Gospel, contrary to their own Doctrine. That *Moses* was infallibly Inspired in all that he commanded the People from God, is sure; but that ever he prest them to receive the Word of God on his own Authority, or any but Gods, can never be proved. If they say that the People received the Word on the account of the Miracles wrought by *Moses*, that is more to our purpose than

Becan. Man. Controv. l. 1. c. 3.

than theirs. And what ſhall we ſay of the Law *written in Mens hearts*? on whoſe Authority is that received? it is the ſame for ſubſtance with the Law *written in the Word*, and muſt there be the Teſtimony of the Church to aſſure men that even this Law too is of God? Or, if it be acknowledged for its own light and power whereby it manifeſts it ſelf to be of God, Why may not the Law written in the Word be ſo acknowledged too? But come we further down; On whoſe Authority were the Sermons of the Prophets, after *Moſes*'s time received? When they ſpoke to the People in the Name of the Lord, did they ever cite the Teſtimony of the Church to vouch what they ſaid to be indeed from the Lord? Or, did they ever ſeek the ſuffrages of the high Prieſts, and Governours of the Church to eſtabliſh their Doctrine as Divine? their ordinary ſtile is, *Thus ſaith the Lord*, not thus ſaith the Church; or the Church ſays, That the Lord ſaith thus. Laſtly, if we deſcend to the Times of the New Teſtament, we ſhall find the ſame there: When our Saviour Chriſt himſelf preached, what he ſpoke was as much the Word of God when he ſpake it, as now that it is written; but neither did he refer himſelf as to the Divinity of his Doctrine, to the Authority of the Church; nor did any believe it on that account. He did not refer it to the Church, for he did *not receive Teſtimony from men*, Joh. 5. 34. No not from *John Baptiſt* himſelf, though of no ſmall Authority in the *Jewiſh* Church, and generally taken to be a Prophet. Though *John*, as his duty was, did bear witneſs to Chriſt, and point to him, *Joh.* 1. *This is the Lamb of God, &c.* yet Chriſt had no need of this Teſtimony, to make himſelf be received as the *Meſſiah*, or what he preached as the Word of God, as if the one or the other could not have been received without it. He therefore tells the *Jews*, *Joh.* 5. 36. That he had *greater witneſs than that of John*; firſt his *Works*, then his *Father himſelf*, ver. 37. then the Written Word, ver. 39. *Search the Scriptures, &c. they are they that teſtifie of me.* All this while here is not one tittle of the Church, and its Teſtimony; and if that be the only means whereby men can be aſſured of the Divineneſs of the Word, How comes Chriſt to overlook it? And that they who believed Chriſts Doctrine did not believe it on the Authority of the Church is clear; for the Church of the *Jews* was generally corrupt, erred in many things, and therefore was unfit; and it was, eſpecially as to its Guides and Officers, generally againſt Chriſt, and therefore unwilling to give Teſtimony to him; it neither own'd him, nor his Doctrine; ſo that they who received and believed Chriſts Preaching did it on ſome other account than the Teſtimony of the then-preſent Church. If the Papiſts ſhall ſay, they received his Doctrine on the account of Chriſts own Divine Authority; I would enquire, How they came to know he had any ſuch Authority? for that Chriſt was the Meſſiah, and conſequently had this Divine Authority, were ſome of the Truths he preached. If they ſay, That Chriſts Doctrine was received either upon the account of his Miracles, or of its agreement with the

Scripture of the Old Teſtament; they ſay more for us than for themſelves, and either way deſert their cauſe. And if we look to the Apoſtles that followed Chriſt, and preached the ſame Doctrine, we ſhall ſee that it was not received on the account of the Church, no more than commanded to the hearers thereon: *Act.* 2. upon *Peters* Preaching, three thouſand believed, *they gladly received the word*, ver. 41. they did not it ſeems, expect the Teſtimony of the Church to tell them, Whether it were the Word or not. *Act.* 4. 4. we read of either five thouſand more, or ſo many as made up the whole five thouſand. And *Act.* 3. the *Samaritans* receive the Goſpel on *Philips* Preaching, and afterward the Eunuch; and (to paſs by others) the *Bereans*, and *Theſſalonians* receive the Word, *Act.* 17. Of the former it is ſaid, *v.* 11. That they *received the Word with all readineſs of mind, and daily ſearched the Scriptures, &c.* Of the latter *Paul* teſtifies, 1 *Theſſ.* 2. 13. *That they received the Word, not as the Word of Man, but as it is indeed the Word of God.* All this while here is no Church interpoſing its Authority, or aſſerting the Divineneſs of what *Peter* or *Philip*, or *Paul* preached. On what account then did theſe People believe the Word preached by the Apoſtles? On the Authority of the Church ſay the Papiſts: But what Church? "Why ſays "a great one among them, ſpeaking of the *Theſſalonians*, *the voice of* Staplet. "*Paul was the voice of the Church*, when he preached to the *Theſſalonians*, "and ſo they in receiving the Word on *Pauls* Authority received it on "the Authority of the Church: Say the ſame of *Peter* and *Philip*. *Paul* it ſeems then was the Church, or elſe how could *Pauls* Preaching be the voice of the Church? What kind of Church then was *Paul?* was he the Church *Virtual*, was he a Pope, and was *Peter* and *Philip*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts ſo too? A bleſſed Church ſure that had ſo many Popes, or rather a miſerable one, that either had no viſible Head, or had ſo many. If they ſay, *Pauls* voice was the voice of the Church, becauſe he was an Officer of it, by whom the Church publiſhed the Doctrine ſhe believed and was to propagate: *Paul* was indeed an Officer of the Church, but yet made ſo *by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, not an Apoſtle of men, nor by man*, Gal. 1. 1. And the Doctrine he preached was no otherwiſe the Doctrine of the Church, than as it was the ſame which the Church believed, but never taught it him; for he *received it not of men, neither was taught it, but by the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt*, *ver.* 12. and therefore they might more reaſonably have ſaid, That the voice of *Paul* was the voice of Chriſt, the Word he preached being more properly the Word of Chriſt who was the Author of it, than the Word of the Church who only received it of Chriſt. But what will become of this fine invention of our Jeſuit, if the *Theſſalonians* did not receive the Word on the Authority of *Paul* himſelf, whether in his ſingle or repreſentative Capacity, (or call it as you pleaſe)? and ſure they did not: For then his Authority muſt be own'd, e're on the account of that his Preaching could be believed; but both *Paul* and his Authority (what-

(whatever it were) was unknown to the *Theſſalonians* when he firſt preached among them, and therefore could not induce them to believe what he taught. The ſame we may ſay of the other Apoſtles in their firſt planting the Goſpel, when they came to the Gentiles; they were unknown till they made themſelves and their Authority known by their Preaching: And when they came to the *Jews* where they were known, yet they were not truſted, nor their Apoſtolical Authority acknowledged, and ſo it could prevail neither with the one, nor with the other till their Doctrine was firſt believed.

Arg. 3. The Scripture hath its Authority in relation *to us* before the Church paſs its judgment concerning it, and therefore it hath not that Authority from the Church. This will appear;

1. By the Conceſſion of the Papiſts themſelves, who acknowledg, That the Church only declares the Scripture to be Authentick, but doth not make it ſo; ſure then it was Authentick in it ſelf before that Declaration of the Church, which is only a pronouncing that to be, which was before. And if it be in it ſelf Authentick it is ſo *to us* too, that is, it hath in it ſelf a power of binding us to the belief of it, ſo ſoon as we come to hear of it, whether the Church hath declared its authentickneſs or not.

2. If the Scripture hath not its Authority as *to us* before the Judgment of the Church, then either it muſt be a private or publick Judgment of the Church which gives it that Authority: a private one it cannot be; for when we ſpeak of the Authority of the Scripture *as to us*, it is underſtood of all Chriſtians every-where, and it is not fit that a private Judgment of the Church, or (which is the ſame) the Judgment of a private Church ſhould give Laws to all the reſt: Nor can it be the publick Teſtimony, or that of the Catholick Church, for none ſuch can be produced by the Papiſts, from whence the Scripture hath its Authority; let them if they can ſhew us the firſt General Council that ever declared the Scripture to be the Word of God. The Council of *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. if it were a General one, is the firſt we read of, and that toucheth not the Point in hand, doth not declare the Scripture to be Authentick, but takes it for granted. They that were there met cite the Scripture of the Old Teſtament, and thereby own its Authority, but do not then firſt eſtabliſh it; and *Peter* and the reſt do the like in their Preaching, *Act.* 2. 3. and dare the Papiſts ſay then, That the Old Teſtament was not Authentick before this Council? Had the Church hitherto no certain Canon, nor Authentick Scripture to be the Rule of its Faith? After this Council we find no General one till that of *Nice*, and was the Church of God all this while too, for three hundred years, without the Canon of the Scripture? To ſay nothing that the Council of *Nice* it ſelf did never define which it was, but acknowledged it as already received.

3. If a Council meets to declare the Divine Authority of the Scrip-

ture, we would know by what Authority it meets? If the several Pastors of the Church come together on the Authority and by the command of the Scripture it self, then it hath its Authority before they meet, else it could not make it their duty so to do: If by some Revelation or impulse of the Spirit without the Scripture, what kind of Spirit is that which acts in separation from the Scripture? And if the Papists will affirm this, let them no more call themselves *good Catholicks*, but even the *worst of Fanaticks*.

Arg. 4. The Authority of the Church is not more certain or clear *to us*, than that of the Scripture, and therefore the Scripture cannot have its Authority from it. That which proves another thing must it self be more clear and better known: But that the Authority of the Church is not better known to us than that of the Scripture will soon appear; for whatever Authority the Church hath, she must prove it either from her self, or from something else: If from any thing else, it must either be from the Testimony of those that are out of the Church, but they know not the Church, nor any Authority it hath; or from the Scripture, but then the Authority of the Scripture must be more known than that of the Church; or from the Spirit, but how will they make it out that they have the Testimony of the Spirit for them, otherwise than by the Scripture, in and by which he is wont to bear witness? If they say the Spirit witnesseth to the Authority of the Church *inwardly*, so as to perswade the minds of Dissenters that the Church is the Church of God; this is meerly beg'd, and not proved, and yet will not satisfie neither, for we ask not What is the Efficient Cause of mens believing the Authority of the Church, but What is the Argument whereon that belief is grounded, and whereby the Church perswades Men of its own Authority? Or else on the other side, if the Church prove its Authority from it self, then the same thing shall be proved by it self: But yet I ask, What Judgment of the Church is it, whereby its Authority is proved? They say both the Testimony of the Ancient, and of the Present Church. But how can the Testimony of the Ancient Church be known, but by the Writings of those that formerly lived, the Books of Fathers, and Decrees of Councils? But we would know how we shall have greater assurance that those Books were written by those Fathers whose Names they bear, and those Decrees made by those Councils to which they are ascribed, than that the Scripture is the Word of God? How came we to be more certain that *Cyprian's*, or *Austin's* Works were Writ by them, than that the four Gospels were Written by the four Evangelists, or *Paul's* Epistles by him? And if the Present Church prove its Authority by the Ancient Church, it must prove it but to very few; for they are but few that ever saw, and yet fewer that ever read the Writings of the Ancients, and many perhaps have never heard of them. And besides, the Ancient Church was sometime the Present Church, and when it was so, from whence might it prove its

its Authority? From some more Ancient no doubt, according to our Adversaries discourse, it must be. But from whence did the first Church prove its Authority (for we must come to a first) when there was none before it to prove it by? Lastly, the Authority of the Present Church cannot be proved by the Testimony of the Present Church: For then it must be either by a part of it, but that cannot be; for a part of the Present Church is inferior to the whole of it, and he that questions the Authority of the whole, will no less question that of a part; Or else, by the whole Church, and then the Authority of the whole Church must be proved by the Authority of the whole Church; we must believe She is the Church, because She says She is the Church.

Arg. 5. If we are to believe the Divinity of the Scripture, meerly on the Churches Authority, then that Faith can be but an humane Faith, because founded on no better than the Authority of Men: our Faith can be no better than its Foundation; a Divine Faith cannot be built upon humane Testimony; but the Papists themselves are ashamed to own a thing so grosly absurd, as that the Faith whereby we believe one main Article of Religion, the Divineness of the Scripture, should be but an humane Faith.

Except. To this therefore they say, That the Faith whereby we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God is a Divine Faith, and built on the Testimony of God, and that Testimony is no other than the Testimony of the Church. We easily reply,

Ans. 1. That the Churches Testimony is no otherwise the Testimony of God, than as it agrees with the Word of God; and when it doth so we are to believe what the Church says, not merely because the Church says it, but because God says it: And if the Church holds forth to me any Divine Truth, and I yield my assent to it, merely because the Church declares it to me, though what I believe be a Divine Truth, yet the Faith with which I receive it will be but an humane Faith; the Truth is *of God*, but my Faith is *in Man*; Whereas if I believe any Truth because God speaks it, though not by the Church nor any Officer of it, but some private Person, yet my Faith is a Divine Faith, and the Testimony of a private person speaking what the Scripture speaks, is as really the voice of God as the Testimony of the Church.

Deus per Ecclesiam loquens non aliter loquitur, quam si immediate per Visiones & somnia, aut quovis alio supernaturali modo revelandi, nobis loqueretur. *Staplet.*

2. Some of the most Learned of the Papists themselves make a great difference between the Testimony of God, and of the Church; the former they grant to be *altogether* Divine, the latter *modo quodam*, after a sort Divine; the former they reckon to be the *primary* Foundation of Faith, the latter but the *secondary*; nay some of them acknowledg that Faith which rests only on the Authority of the Church, not to be Divine; and some the Churches Testimony to be but the *conditio sine qua non*, the condition without which we cannot believe the Divinity of the Scriptures, which sure they would scarce do if they thought the Testimony of the Church to be the Testimony of God: And if the Testimony

Bellarm. Becan. apud Roh. Baron. Melchior. Can. l. 2. c. 8.

mony of the Church be but in *some sort* a Divine Teſtimony, the Faith which is built upon it can be but in *some ſort* a Divine Faith: and if the Teſtimony of the Church be but the *ſecondary* Foundation of Faith, How comes it to be (according to *Stapleton*) the Teſtimony of God himſelf, which ſure they will allow to be the *primary* Foundation of Faith?

3. Before they can evince the Teſtimony of the Church to be the Teſtimony of God, they muſt firſt prove the Church to be abſolutely Infallible, and ſee they agree among themſelves about it, leſt we be ſtill at a loſs how to know what is that Church whoſe Teſtimony is the voyce of God himſelf.

And 4. If I do but deny the Teſtimony of the Church to be the Teſtimony of God (as we do) how will they prove it? By the Teſtimony of the Church; I ſhall not take its word. Or will they ſay it hath ſuch Notes of its being the Voice of God in it, as thereby to manifeſt it ſelf to be his Voice? They will get nothing by that, for I am ready to ſay the ſame of the Scripture. Or, Laſtly, Will they prove it by the Scripture? Then they plainly give away their Cauſe, and own the Authority of the Scripture to be before the Teſtimony of the Church.

Arg. 6. If we muſt believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, only becauſe the Church determines it to be ſo, then we muſt believe all things in it to be of God for the ſame reaſon only: That *Chriſt came into the world to ſave ſinners*, that *whoever believeth in him, ſhall have Everlaſting Life*, &c. and all the Promiſes of the Goſpel muſt be believed to be made to us by God, only becauſe the Church tells us they were, and the Truth of them, *as to us*, depends meerly on the Churches Authority, and ſo all the comfort of our hearts, and the hopes we have of Heaven muſt be primarily derived from the Authority of the Church, and ultimately reſolved into it: What a caſe had we been in if it had not pleaſed the Church to receive theſe Promiſes into the Canon? and if the Papiſts ſay true, ſhe might not have received them; for (as we ſhall ſee by and by) it depends wholly upon the Church what Books ſhall be Canonical, and what not, and by the ſame reaſon what parts of thoſe Books; and conſequently, whether all the Promiſes of the Goſpel ſhall be Canonical or not; and ſo we ow all our *Hope* to the Churches *Charity*, and muſt count her a good-natur'd Mother for not cutting off theſe *Breaſts of Conſolation*, but leaving ſomething for her poor Children to hang upon, to keep them from periſhing. Belike it is the Churches favour that all the World is not damned. I am ſure the beſt Promiſes in the Scripture, if the Popiſh Doctrine take place, can afford but cold comfort. For if I be asked, What ground I have for my Hopes of Salvation? I anſwer the Promiſes of God. If I be asked again, Are theſe Promiſes true? I anſwer, Yes. But how doth that appear? Why, becauſe God made them. But how do I know God made them? Well enough; for the Church ſays he did. Here the Authority of the Church is the firſt Foundation of all my Hopes: And poor ones, God knows,

1 Tim. 1. 15. John 3. 16.

See the Papiſts Objections.

they

they are, if no better grounded, and little comfort I am like to have in them. It is to little purpoſe to tell me, the Teſtimony of the Church is not *meerly* Humane; for is it meerly Divine! If it be not, it cannot found a Faith which is meerly Divine: And when my Soul, and the everlaſting Salvation of it, lies at ſtake, I think I am concerned to ſee that my Faith and Hopes have a ſure Foundation; and that I am ſure none can be which is not meerly Divine.

Arg. 7. If the Teſtimony of the Church is neceſſary, and the only ſufficient Reaſon of our believing the Divineneſs of the Scripture, then it will certainly follow, that no man who is out of the Church, can be called into the Church by the Scripture; Which is pretty ſtrange Doctrine, and yet I ſee not how poſſibly the Papiſts can evade it; for they that are called into the Church by the Scripture are perſwaded by the Scripture, and convinced by it that it is their duty to joyn themſelves to the Church: But this can never be if the Scripture be of no Authority with them; whatever convinceth or perſwades a man muſt certainly have ſome Authority with him; and if therefore the Church perſwades men by the Scripture, that Scripure muſt needs be received, and own'd ere they be joined to the Church; the Scripture being the very Reaſon and Argument whereby they are perſwaded. The Concluſion will not be yielded to if the *Medium* from whence it is infer'd be not firſt granted; and in this caſe the Scripture is the *Medium* the Church makes uſe of in perſwading men to embrace her Society. Thus it was in the beginning of the Goſpel-Church, *Acts* 2. *Peter* diſproves the conceit ſome of the *Jews* had of him, and the reſt of the Apoſtles, that they *were full of new Wine*, by the Teſtimony of Scripture, *Joel* 2. 28. Prophecying concerning the pouring out of the Holy Ghoſt in the latter days. Then he proves the Reſurrection of Chriſt, by *Pſal.* 16. 8, *&c.* And his Aſcenſion into Heaven, by *Pſal.* 110. 1. And his being the Chriſt promiſed to *David* to be of the fruit of his Loins, by *Pſal.* 132. 11. And hereupon follows the bringing into the Church three thouſand of the Hearers, who *When they heard theſe things, were pricked in their hearts*, Act. 2. 32. And ſo *ch.* 3. How often doth *Peter* cite the Prophets, particularly, *Moſes* v. 22.? And *Philip* thus Preacheth to the Eunuch out of the Prophet *Iſaiah*, *ch.* 8. And *Peter* again to *Cornelius* out of the Prophets, *ch.* 10. 43. And *Paul Act.* 13. where we find ſome both Jews and Gentiles wrought on by his Preaching, and brought into the Church. And was it the Authority of theſe Apoſtles, that is, in the Papiſts ſtile, the Church, that perſwaded thus many? Alas, they that heard them did not once dream of their being the Church, and therefore did not believe on that account.

Vid. Chan. Panſtrat. de Can. l. 6. 18.

Arg. 8. No Law receives its Authority of binding Men to ſubjection to it, from thoſe that are merely ſubject to it, and did not make it; therefore the Scripture hath not its Authority from the Church, which is merely ſubject to it as a Law, and is not the Author of it.

The

The whole Church is ſo, and not only Paſtors but People; and if the Pope himſelf be not under the Scripture, as the Law by which he is to be ruled, well may he paſs for ὁ ἄνομος, that wicked, or *lawleſs* One ſpoken of 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 8. True indeed, a Law may be made known by an Herald that proclaims it, but Who can ſay it receives its Authority of binding the Subjects from him, when he himſelf is one of them, and as much bound to it, as any elſe? Allow the Church to be the Herald which Proclaims and Publiſheth this Law, Muſt She therefore give Authority to it? Put caſe, a Subject hear of a Law though not by an Herald, Is he not bound to ſubmit to it, becauſe he did not hear it proclaimed? Suppoſe a Man come to the knowledg of the Scripture, ſome other way than by the Miniſtery of the Church, in the Popiſh ſenſe, that is, the Paſtors of it, as it is ſtoried the *Indians*, and the *Iberians* did by the help of private Perſons, Is he not bound to ſubmit to it? Muſt he ſuſpend his Belief till he have the Teſtimony of the Church to aſſure him that the Scripture is of God?

"If it be ſaid, that a Law doth not bind till it be promulged, and "the promulgation of it is the Churches buſineſs. I Anſwer; God hath publiſhed his Law ſufficiently in the Scripture, and to it all muſt be ſubject to whom the Scripture comes, whether the Church further tells them that it is the Word of God or not; as in the caſe mentioned it was received and ſubmitted to. I wonder how the Church was the Herald that proclaimed the Law of God to the *Iberians*, when they received it from a poor captive Woman. *Stapleton* (before) tells us, That when *Paul* preached to the *Theſſalonians* his voice was the voice of the Church; And I pray was this poor Womans voice the voice of the Church too? By my conſent let her even be the Church it ſelf, *virtual*, *infallible*, a meer *Pope Joan* the firſt. But further, if the Church publiſh this Law we ſpeak of, and it doth not bind till publiſhed by her, Upon what account did ſhe her ſelf believe it when ſhe firſt publiſhed it? (Let the Queſtion be concerning the Herald himſelf why he believes the Law which himſelf proclaims?) Doth the Church believe the Scripture to be the Word of God at all antecedently to her own publiſhing and propounding it to others, or not? Is her Faith wrought in her by the Teſtimony ſhe her ſelf gives to the Scripture, or by ſomething before? I ſuppoſe the Papiſts will ſcarce be ſo mad as to ſay the former; For what kind of Faith muſt that be, when a man believes meerly upon his own Teſtimony? And how can the Church be the Church before ſhe believes? If they ſay, the Churches Faith in the Scripture was wrought in her before her own Teſtimony concerning its Divineneſs, I would fain know what that is by which it is wrought? If it be any thing in the Word it ſelf, or be the Teſtimony of the Spirit, Why may not I, or any man elſe believe the Scripture before the Church give in her Teſtimony concerning it, upon the ſame account that ſhe her ſelf doth? But if ſhe believe the Divinity of the Scripture upon the Teſtimony

mony of the former Church, I would know again, What better assurance he hath of the Testimony of the former Church than of the Scripture it self, seeing he can know it only out of the Writings of the Ancients? and whoever questions the Authority of the Scripture, may upon much better grounds question the Writings of Fathers, and Decrees of Councils, as was said before.

Arg. 9. They that believe not the Scripture to be the Word of God, when propounded to them as such, though they have not the Testimony of the Church to confirm them in it, yet Sin in their not believing it, and are therefore bound to believe it, antecedently to the Church's Testimony (for if they were not bound to believe it, they should not Sin in disbelieving it) and consequently the Scripture hath its Authority in it self, and before the Testimony of the Church; and therefore not from it. That Men Sin in not believing the Scripture even without the Churches Testimony, is proved from *Act.* 13. 46, 51. where *Paul* shakes off the Dust of his Feet against the Unbelieving Jews, and tells them, they *Judg themselves unworthy of Eternal Life*. See *Act.* 28. 24. &c. where he declares their actual Unbelief to be the effect of their hard-heartedness, which though it might be judicial, they being left of God to themselves and their own Lusts, yet withal it was sinful too, and contracted by themselves. And will any Man say, That these Jews in refusing the Gospel did not Sin? I suppose the Papists themselves scarce will. If they say, as formerly, That *Pauls* Testimony was the Testimony of the Church; I answer, Those Jews own'd no such thing as a Gospel-Church, nor any Authority it had to bind them to the Belief of the Gospel; and consequently could not own *Paul* as an Officer of that Church, his Apostleship being merely a Gospel-Office, which Man could not submit to who did not first receive the Gospel by which he was constituted an Apostle. If they say, they might know him to be an Apostle by the Miracles he wrought; I answer again, That *Act.* 13. when he Preached at *Antioch in Pisidia*, we have no mention of any Miracle he there wrought, yet some both Jews and Gentiles believed, v. 42, 43. And therefore they neither received himself nor his Preaching upon the account of his Miracles, nor could Miracles make it the Duty of the unbelieving Jews to submit to *Paul* as an Officer of the Gospel-Church when no Miracle was wrought by him. If it be said that he was known by the fame of his Miracles elsewhere wrought which gave credit to him; Then it will follow, that *Paul* was to be believed for his Miracles sake, as well as the Gospel for his sake; and thence again, That the Gospel was not to be believed merely for *Pauls* own Authority, but principally for his Miracles, it being for their sake that he himself was owned as having any Authority; and if so, Either *Pauls* Authority was not the Authority of the Church, or the Authority of *Paul* as the Church was not Supream, for that of his Miracles was above it: That which procured credit to him was of greater Authority

than himself. Upon the whole it seems by this reply of the Papists that Miracles were the great thing which procured credit to *Paul's* Preaching; and if they did, the Authority of the Church did not, unless, as before they made *Paul* and the Church the same, so here they will make Miracles and the Church the same.

Arg. 10 It cannot be certainly known by the Testimony of the Church, that the Scripture is the Word of God, and therefore it hath not, as *to us*, its Authority from the Church. If it may be certainly known that the Scripture is the Word of God, by the Testimony of the Church, then, Either it must be by the Testimony of the Universality of Believers, or of the Pastors; not the former, for beside that the Papists themselves exclude them, and say that the Scripture is to have Authority *with* them, but not *from* them. Either we speak of the Multitude of Believers separately and disjunctively, and so they cannot give credit to the Scripture, when they are all of them fallible and liable to Error: Or else all together and in conjunction, but so likewise they cannot certifie us of the Divineness of the Scripture, because they never did, never will meet together to do it; and we may stay long enough ere we believe the Divinity of the Scripture, if we tarry till all the Believers in the World meet together to give in their Verdict concerning it. If we speak of the Church merely in the Popish sence, for the Pastors of it, there will be as much uncertainty as in the other; for either we must consider them separately too, or in conjunction; if separately, they are all liable to Error, and according to the Papists themselves they do all believe the Scripture on the Authority of the Church, and therefore cannot give Authority to it; if we consider them all together, when *did*, or when *will* the Pastors of all the Churches in the World meet together to give their joynt Testimony to the Scripture? And if they should, Why are we bound to believe them? They were not infallible singly, nor can they be any more so conjunctly, if all the several parts of the integral, the Church, be liable to Error or Corruption, Why is not the whole? But suppose the Pastors meet by their Delegates in a General Council, Will that mend the Matter? Not at all that I see; for it is not yet determined by the Papists themselves, where the Supream Authority, which should give Testimony to the Scripture, doth reside, whether in Pope, Council, or both; and so we are left at uncertainties, and know not to whom to go, whose word to take, but must suspend our belief of the Divineness of the Scripture, till it be agreed upon among our Adversaries, whose Authority is indeed Supream and to be relied upon. Yet put case a General Council be the chief which gives Testimony to the Scripture; How shall we know that this Council hath not Err'd in determining the Scripture to be the Word of God? Shall we know it by the Scripture? It is supposed we doubt concerning that, and so its Testimony is not valid; Or by the Testimony of the Church? Why, this Council is the Church it self, which

Vid. Thes. Salmur.

which determines in its own Case, and so we must believe this Council hath not Err'd, because it says it hath not Err'd. If the Pope be the Church *virtual*, and we must receive the Scripture on his credit, the same Objection will be against him, for How shall we know he doth not Err? By the Scripture? But it is yet in Question; Or by the Testimony of the Church? The Pope himself is this Church, and then we must believe he hath not Erred, only because he saith he hath not Erred. Lastly, Let Pope and Council both together be this Church, How shall we know they both together do not Err? Not by the Scripture, for that is not yet own'd; nor by the Testimony of the Church, for Pope and Council together are this Church, and their Testimony concerning themselves is not to be received. And to conclude, How shall we know that Pope and Council are the Church? Not because they themselves say so, nor because the Scripture doth, for that is not yet believed; nor by the Testimony of the Spirit, for Why shall that bear witness any more to the Church, that it is the Church, than to the Scripture, that it is the Word of God? Nor yet by Notes or Marks inherent in the Church, for, Why may not the same be allowed to the Scripture? And how shall we know these marks to be true, but by the Scripture, by which alone we can judge of the nature and properties of the Church? And yet still it is supposed that the Scripture is not believed.

4. This may suffice to shew the absurdity of the Popish Doctrine, let us in the next place see what grounds they have for it, and how they oppose the Truth. I shall only speak to the chief of their Arguments, and reduce them to as few Heads as well as I can; any that would see them more largely handled, may consult several of our Protestant Divines, who speak more fully to this Point, than the shortness of a Sermon will permit.

Obj. "Either (say they) the Authority of the Scripture must be known "by the Church, or by the Scripture it self, or by the Testimony of the "Spirit; but it cannot be known either of the two latter ways, and therefore can only the first. First, That it cannot be known by the Scrip- "ture it self, they prove, because neither the whole Scripture can be "proved by the whole, nor one part of it by another. For if a man "deny the whole Scripture it will be in vain to attempt the proof of "one part by another, when such a one doth no more receive the Autho- "rity of one part than of another. And the whole cannot be proved "by the whole, for then the same thing should be proved by it self; "and whereas that which is brought to prove another thing should it "self be more clear than that which it is to prove, in this case one ob- "scure thing should prove another; or rather an obscure thing be "brought to prove it self, for the whole Scripture cannot be said to be "more clear, or better known than it self. Before I propound the other part of their proof, I shall answer to this.

Anſ. The Divine Authority of the Scripture may be known by the Scripture it ſelf. For, 1. The Authority of one part of it may be proved by another part to thoſe that do not deny the whole. Some there have been, and ſtill may be, who have received ſome part of the Scriptures, and not others; to ſuch we may prove that part which they deny, by that which they all. The *Sadducees* acknowledged the Five Books of *Moſes*, but not the Prophets; our Saviour Chriſt therefore when he had to do with them, did not cite the Prophetie of *Daniel* to prove the Reſurrection of the Dead, but *Moſes* Writings, *Mat.* 22. But when he dealt with others of the *Jews* who received the whole Old Teſtament, he proved what he ſpake out of other parts of it, out of the Prophets themſelves; and ſo bids them more generally ſearch the Scripture. Why may not we do likewiſe? We ſhall ſee how the Old and New Teſtament prove each other, ſo that we may argue with men that acknowledg the one, ſo as by that they allow, to prove that which they deny.

1. The Old Teſtament is proved by the New, *Luk.* 24. 44. Chriſt divides the whole Old Teſtament into *Moſes, the Prophets and the Pſalms*, and thereby declares them all to be Canonical; that was then the uſual way by which the *Jews* did divide the Old Teſtament. And here in the Text, *Abraham* ſends *Dives's* Brethren to *Moſes* and the Prophets. And *Joh.* 10. 34, 35. Chriſt mentioning a place out of the *Pſalms*, bears witneſs to the whole Old Teſtament under the name of the Scripture, *The Scripture cannot be broken.* And we find particular parts of the Old Teſtament proved in the New, *Mat.* 5. Chriſt confirms the Law of *Moſes* as to its Divine Authority, when he explains it, beſide other places in which he ſpeaks of ſome particular Laws, *Mat.* 12. 42. and *Luk.* 4. 26, and eſpecially *Heb.* 11. the Hiſtorical part of the Scripture is confirmed; and how many Teſtimonies have we out of the Pſalms and Prophets every where, which do the ſame. The twelve leſſer Prophets are at once proved by *Stevens* alledging them, *Act.* 7. 42. where the Teſtimony cited is out of *Amos*; but *Steven* mentions the *Book of the Prophets, i.e.* That Volume of the ſmaller Prophets which among the *Jews* was reckoned as one Book.

2. The New Teſtament is confirmed by the Old. For how often doth Chriſt and his Apoſtles prove their Doctrine out of the Old Teſtament? when they quote the Old Teſtament, it is a good proof of its Authority to any that own the New; and when by thoſe Quotations they prove their own Doctrine, it is a good Argument for the proof of the New Teſtament, to them that believe the Old, as the caſe was of the *Jews* at that time; and therefore our Saviour Chriſt refers them to the Old Teſtament, particularly *Moſes*, *Joh.* 5. 45, 46. for the proof of the great Doctrine he held forth to them, *That he was the Meſſiah* that ſhould come into the World. So *Peter*, *Act.* 3. refers to *Deut.* 18. to prove what he was preaching, *A Prophet ſhall the Lord your God raiſe up to you, &c.* The ſame we may ſay of the Types of the Old Teſtament, that they confirm

firm the New, in which we find them fulfilled. If any say, We find no particular confirmation of *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Esther*, in the New Testament: I answer, They are confirmed by our Saviour Christ in his general Division of the Old Testament according to the *Jewish* account, into *the Law*, *the Prophets*, *and the Psalms*, under which these Books were contained; the whole Volume of the *Hagiographa* going under the name of the *Psalms*.

2. But now, what if we have to do with those that deny the whole Scripture, admit no part of it, How shall we convince them that it is the Word of God? I answer,

1. Not by the Church, be sure; for if they have no reverence for any part of the Scripture, they will have as little for the Church, which hath no being as a Church, but from the Scripture; and therefore it will be a most vain thing to attempt a proof of the Scripture either in part, or in the whole, by the Church, which is as unknown in the nature of a Church, to them that question the Scripture, as the Scripture it self is.

2. We would prove the whole Scripture by the whole, as well as one part of it by another. For as the whole systeme of Gods Works in the Creation proves it self to be of God, and to have him for its Author, *Psal.* 19. 1, *&c.* by all those eminent signs and effects of Gods Goodness, Power and Wisdom which are to be seen in the whole: So likewise doth the whole Scripture prove God to be the Author of it, by all those signs and evidences of his Wisdom, Goodness, Power and Holiness which appear in the whole, and manifest it to be of God. Nor doth it follow from hence, That if the whole Scripture prove it self, it is, as the Papists say, more known than it self, *simply and absolutely*, though *in some respects*, it certainly may be so, as a man in one respect may be more known than himself in another: A man when he hath given some eminent proofs of his Learning, is thereby more known than without them he is; so the Scripture too considered with all those Evidences of Gods Goodness, Wisdom, Holiness, *&c.* which appear in it, is more known than it self when these are not considered. How do we prove the Sun to be the Sun but by the glory of its light, which so far excels the light of other Stars? and is not the Sun considered with its light more known to us than considered in it self? How do we come to the knowledg of the nature of things in the World, but by considering their Properties, Qualities, Effects, *&c.* which plainly declare what their nature is; seeing such Properties, *&c.* could not be but where such a nature is? So likewise here, there are those Properties in the Scripture, those Excellencies which could be from none but God, and therefore make it appear that that Writing which hath those Excellencies in it is of God. To speak of these distinctly is not my present business, not having to do with them that deny the Scripture.

2. "We cannot (say the Papists again) know the Scripture to be the "Word of God, by the Testimony of the Spirit; for either it is by the "publick Testimony, which is that of the Church, and if this be gran-

"ted,

ted, they have enough; or its private Testimony, but then (they say) it will follow, 1. That our Faith in the Scripture is Enthusiasm. 2. That if the private Testimony of the Spirit be questioned, it cannot be proved but by the Scripture; and so the Scripture being proved by the Spirit, and the Spirit again by the Scripture, we shall run in a round, which is no lawful way of arguing.

Answ. To this I answer; That we know the Scripture to be of God by the publick Testimony of the Spirit, but I deny his publick Testimony to be his witnessing by the Church; it is indeed his witnessing by the Scripture it self when he witnesseth it to be of God, by those Excellencies of it which evidence it so to be; and this he witnesseth to all that have their eyes open to see it, and in that respect it may be called publick; and when he witnesseth the same thing by the same means, in the hearts of particular Believers, and so applys his publick Testimony to private Consciences, enlightning and enabling such to believe upon his publick Testimony; you may if you please call that his private Testimony. This clearly cuts off all that the adversaries object, and no such things will follow, as they pretend, upon what we maintain. We know no other private Testimony of the Spirit, but this particular application of his publick one; and then I am sure there is no danger of Enthusiasm. For that is properly Enthusiasm when God reveals any thing to mens minds immediately and in an extraordinary way, and without the intervention of the usual means whereby he is wont to make himself known to men, as in former times he did to the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, (and the Enthusiasm both the Papists and we find fault with is, when men pretend to this which yet they have not.) But when God makes known his Will in an ordinary way, by the use of instruments and means for the conveying of Spiritual knowledg to them, this is not Enthusiasm, as when *Faith comes by hearing*, Rom. 10. And so it is in the case before us; when the Spirit witnesseth to the hearts of private Believers that the Scripture is the Word of God, he doth it in an ordinary way, working in them a Faith of the Scripture, by those Arguments of Divinity, which are in the Scripture it self, and makes use of them, as means to induce them to believe. As the light and brightness of the Sun is the *Medium* whereby it is known to be the Sun; so that Divine light and power which is in the Word, is the very *Medium* and Argument, whereby the Spirit (enabling us to perceive it) perswades us that that Word is the Word of God. And I would ask our Adversaries, Can a private man believe the Divinity of the Scripture meerly on the Authority of the Church, without the Spirits witnessing it to him by that Authority? if they say, Yes, then they must acknowledg that Faith to be meerly humane because not wrought by God; if they say, No, (as they must if they be constant to themselves in holding that the Spirit witnesseth by the Church) then when the Spirit witnesseth to the Conscience of a private Believer by the Church, why is not that Enthusiasm too? for when he wit-

witnesseth to a private Conscience by this application of his publick Testimony, here is as much a private Spirit, and a private Testimony as any we speak of; the only difference is in the *Medium* the Spirit useth in this private work, which they say is the Testimony of the Church, and we say, is the Scripture it self; both of us agree that it is the Spirits publick Testimony, but they call one thing so, and we another. If they say, That yet this is not Enthusiasm, because here is no immediate Revelation, but means are made use of; I say the same of the Spirits witnessing to the Divinity of the Scripture in the heart of a private Believer, by the Scripture it self, or those notes of Divinity which are apparent in the Word; this is no more immediate than the other, nor any less by the intervention of means.

And for the other Consequent they would infer from the private Testimony of the Spirit, that then we shall run in a round, and prove "the Scripture to be the Word of God by the Testimony of the Spirit, "and prove the Spirit again by the Scripture. There is as little fear of this as of the other: For we bring not the private Testimony of the Spirit in our Consciences (against which only this Objection is made), or his applying his publick Testimony to us in a way of illumination and conviction of our minds, as the Argument inducing us to believe; but that we say, is his publick Testimony in the Word, when he witnesseth its Divinity to us by that Excellency, Light and Power which is in the Word it self, and makes use of that to perswade us to believe. The Spirit indeed is the *Efficient* of our Faith, or the Agent which causeth us to believe, enlightning our minds, and drawing our hearts to consent to the Truth; but the Evidences of Divinity we see in the Scripture, through the Spirits enlightning us, is the *reason or motive* of our believing; they move us to believe *objectively*, but the Spirit *effectively*. So that here is no danger of a Circle in our Discourse, or proving *idem per idem*; for if I be asked, How I know the Scripture to be the Word of God? This question may have a double sense; for either it is meant of the *power and virtue whereby I believe*; and then I answer, By the Power and Efficiency of the Spirit of God opening the eyes of my Understanding, and enabling me to believe; or it is meant of the *Medium* or *Argument* made use of, and by which, *as a Motive*, I am drawn to believe; and then I answer; Those impressions of Divinity the Spirit hath left on the Word, and by which he witnesseth it to be of God, are the Argument or Motive perswading me to believe. Now when they ask *how* I know the Spirit who witnesseth in my Conscience to the Divinity of the Scripture to be the Spirit of God? the Question is plainly by what *Means or Argument* I am perswaded that it is the Spirit of God, and then I answer by those properties of the Spirit which the Scripture mentions. And so the Question, How I know the Scripture to be the Word of God? either is concerning the *Efficient* of my belief of the Scripture, or else it is not to the purpose, (for I do not alledg the Efficiency,

Vid. K. Baron. contra Turneb. Camer. de ver. Dei & Turretin. de Cr. Pontif.

ciency or inward operating of the Spirit, as the *motive* of my Faith; and the latter is concerning the *Objective cause*, or *Argument* inducing me to believe the Spirit to be the Spirit of God. The miſtake is this, They would faſten upon us, that we make the Spirit in his *inward* work upon our hearts to be the *motive* to our Faith, whereas we only make it to be the *Efficient* of our Faith.

To conclude this Anſwer to their firſt Argument: Let us ſee if it may not be retorted upon themſelves. If the Churches Teſtimony give Authority to the Scripture (as Papiſts ſay) then if a Man deny the Authority of the Church, How will they prove it? For neither one part of the Church can give credit to the other, when the whole is queſtioned, nor can the whole Church give credit to it Self, for then the whole Church will be more known than it Self. Or, if we ask, How comes the Church to believe the Scripture? Is it by its own Teſtimony? but ſure it muſt believe it ere it can give Teſtimony to it: Or is it by the Teſtimony of the Spirit? If ſo, Is it by the Publick Teſtimony of the Spirit? That cannot be, for according to them, that is no other than the Teſtimony of the Church it Self, the abſurdity of which hath been already ſhewn. Or if it be the Private Teſtimony of the Spirit, then they by their own arguing, will run into Enthuſiaſm, as well as We. And indeed they do plainly run into a Circle in their proving the Scripture by the Authority of the Church, and the Authority of the Church again by the Scripture; for with them the Authority of the Church is the Motive or Argument whereby they prove the Divine Authority of the Scripture, and that again is the Motive or Argument by which they prove the Authority of the Church. And ſo both the Church and the Scripture are more known than each other, and yet leſs too; more known becauſe they prove each other, and leſs known becauſe they are proved by each other. Here they are themſelves in a nooz, but it is no matter; the Popes *Omnipotency* can eaſily break it, or the Churches Authority make her Logick Canonical, though all the *Ariſtotles* in the World ſhould make it Apocryphal.

Obj. 2. "It is neceſſary for us in Religion to have the Canon of "Scripture certain, but this we cannot have otherwiſe than by the "Church, becauſe its Authority is moſt certain, and the only one which "is ſufficient to remove all doubts concerning the Divineneſs of the "Scripture out of our minds; both becauſe God ſpeaks by the Church, "and becauſe the Church beſt knows the Scripture: She is Chriſts Bride, "and therefore beſt knows the voice of the Bridegroom; ſhe hath the "Spirit of Chriſt, and therefore can beſt judg of his Word, and the "ſtile of it.

Anſ. We deny that the Canon of the Scripture cannot be known but by the Church, and the Contrary hath been already proved: The Scripture hath been owned and received where no ſuch Judgment of the Church hath been. And it is as falſe that the Authority of the Church is

the greateſt and moſt certain; for that of the Scripture upon which the Church and her Authority depends, is above it. God ſpeaks in the Scripture, and by it teacheth the Church her ſelf; and therefore his Authority in the Scripture is greater, the Authority of him that teacheth, than of thoſe by whom he teacheth. As the Authority of a King in his Laws, is greater than that of an Officer that proclaims them. A King may by his Counſel or Judges acquaint his Subjects with his Laws; But will it therefore follow, becauſe he ſpeaks his mind, which is in thoſe Laws, by ſuch Officers, that their Authority is greater than that of thoſe Laws themſelves? God ſpeaks by the Church (the true Church we mean) but he ſpeaks nothing by her but what he ſpeaks in the Scripture, which ſhe doth only Miniſterially declare to us; and therefore the Authority of God and his Law is above hers, who though ſhe publiſh yet did not make it, but is her ſelf ſubject to it, and by that Law only ſtands obliged to publiſh it to others. And for what they ſay of the Church's ability to judge of the Scripture; We anſwer, That She cannot judge of the Stile of the Scripture otherwiſe than by the help of the Spirit, and by the ſame private Chriſtians may judge too, and there be no means whereby the Church can know the Scripture to be the Word of God, but particular Believers may know it by the ſame; And if the Church's Authority be ſo great in our Adverſaries Opinion, becauſe She can ſo well judge of the Stile of the Scripture, How much greater is that of the Scripture, which is able by its Stile to manifeſt it Self to the Church?

Except. 'But (ſay they) we do not know the Voice of Chriſt in the 'Scripture, but by the Church; therefore her Authority is greater.

Anſ. This is both Falſe and Inconſequent. Falſe, for it hath been ſufficiently evinced that the Voice of Chriſt may be otherwiſe known, and hath been too. Inconſequent, in that it follows not that the Authority of the Church is therefore greater than that of the Scripture: *John Baptiſt* directed many to Chriſt, and ſuppoſe without his direction of them and witneſſing to Chriſt they had never come to him, Will it thence follow that *John's* Authority was greater than Chriſts? The Church, we grant may be a mean whereby many are brought to the Belief of the Scripture, who yet afterward do believe upon better grounds, as being perſwaded by the Word it Self.

Obj. 'We can no otherwiſe know the Scripture to be the Word of 'God, than as we know what Books are Canonical, and what not, 'what were written by Inſpired Pen-Men, and what were not; but 'this we can know only by the Authority of the Church. This is 'proved becauſe ſome Books which at firſt were not received as Cano'nical, the Church did afterward receive, as *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Tobit*, *Su'ſanna*, the Books of *Maccabees*, &c. The Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the '*Second of Peter*, *Second and Third of John*, and the *Revelation*. And 'Books which are not Canonical, are therefore not Canonical becauſe

'the Church would not allow them as ſuch; *viz.* The *Revelation of Paul, the Goſpel of Peter, Thomas, Matthias, &c.* And laſtly, Some 'Books written by Prophets and Apoſtles are not Canonical, becauſe 'the Church hath not determined that they are ſo.

Camero. *Anſ.* To let paſs what a Learned Proteſtant largely proves, *viz.* That it is poſſible to know the Scripture to be the Word of God, and yet not know which Books are particularly Canonical, and written by Inſpired Pen-Men; that it may be known that the Doctrine contained in thoſe Books is of God, though it be not known whether it were writ by ſuch as were immediately Inſpired themſelves, or had it from thoſe that were. In the Primitive Times ſome not only Good Men, but Churches too, did deny ſome of thoſe Books to be Canonical which we now generally receive, and yet they did receive the Word of God, and the Doctrine contained in thoſe Books, though they queſtioned whether thoſe Books themſelves were written by ſuch as were immediately Inſpired or not. And do not the Papiſts themſelves tell us, That the Canon of the Scripture was not eſtabliſhed for a long time after the Apoſtles days, till it might be done by General Councils? And yet ſure the Church did in the mean time own the Word of God, and know the Voice of Chriſt.

We ſay then that it may be known which Books are Canonical and which are not, otherwiſe than by the Church, for the Church her Self knows them otherwiſe than by her Self, or Her own Authority. When She declares them to be Canonical, She believes them to be Canonical, and her believing them to be Canonical is Antecedent to Her declaring them to be ſo; She muſt learn Her Self, before She can Teach Others: She believes them therefore to be Canonical, becauſe She ſees the Stamp of God upon them, and that they are ſuch as can be of none but God. (The ſame way likewiſe private Believers may know them.) And when the Church ſees this Stamp of God upon a Book, She thence concludes it to be Divine, and then declares it to be ſo.

Exeep. 'But how then comes it to paſs, That ſome Books of Cano-'nical Scripture were not ſo ſoon received as others, if all have ſuch an 'Impreſs of Divinity upon them?

Anſ. I anſwer; That theſe Notes of Divinity, which are ſufficient in all the ſeveral Books of Scripture to demonſtrate them to be of God, yet may be more clear and illuſtrious in ſome than in others, as Gods Power and Wiſdom may be more apparent, and conſpicuous in ſome of His Works than in others of them: Or elſe it may be from the different degrees of illumination, afforded to different Perſons, and in different Ages: When ſome doubted of ſome Books of Scripture, all did not, and they that did not, had a greater meaſure of the Spirit, as to that at leaſt, than others had.

Now to their particular Proofs of the *Minor* Propoſition in their Arguments, We Anſwer particularly.

1. That

1. That those Books annex'd by the Papists to the Old Testament, and called by them *Deuterocanical*, and by us no better still than *Apocryphal*; such as the Books of *Maccabees*, *Esdras*, *Tobit*, &c. never were received into the Canon by the Ancient Church, nor can they produce the Decree of any one Ancient Council wherein they were owned; as for Modern Councils we matter them not. They say that these Books were doubted of at first, and afterward received. Belike then the Church at first did not know them to be the Word of God; and if she be the Bride of Christ, who best of all knows the Bridegrooms Voice, How came she for so long time not to know it? Here certainly, in spight of *Infallibility*, the Church must be in an Errour; for if she doubted of the Divinity of these Books, when yet they were really Divine, she err'd in so doubting; and if she did know them to be of God, and yet did not receive them, she was more than erroneous, that is, she was plainly rebellious. As for the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *the second of Peter*, and those others which we all own as Canonical, though some particular Persons or Churches might doubt of their Authenticknes, yet it doth not appear that all ever did. Some of the Papists themselves confess that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was generally acknowledged, unless by two or three of the *Latin* Fathers; and *Hierom* reckons both that, and the *Revelation* as generally acknowledged for Canonical. However when these Books were owned as Canonical, it was not on the bare Authority of the Church; For how came the Church her self to acknowledg them? How came she to know that they were written by Inspiration? Did she believe it on her own credit? Or did she not rather receive them as Canonical, because she found them Canonical, perceiving the stamp of God upon them? and sure the same reason might make us receive them, though the Church had not testified concerning them.

Speaking of both; *Et tamen Nos utramq; suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum Scriptorum Authoritatem sequentes, qui plerunq; utriusq; utuntur Testimoniis, non ut interdum de Apocryphis facere solent, &c.* Epist. ad Darden.

2. To the second Thing they alledg, concerning the *Revelation of Paul*, the *Gospel of Peter*, &c. or any Book written by Philosophers, or by Hereticks; I answer, That if the Church did reject them, she did do but her duty, and it will not follow from her rejecting them, that there was no other way of knowing them not to be Canonical, beside the Churches disowning them. For upon what grounds did the Church disown them? Upon her own Authority? Then sure rejected them because she rejected them, judged them not to be Canonical because she judged them not to be Canonical. If she did disown them because she saw not that Dignity and Excellency in them, which she saw in the Books of the Old and New Testament, and which might perswade that they were of God; sure then it was not meerly the Churches Authority which made them not to be Canonical, and on the same grounds that the Church rejected those Books, we likewise may do it. Sure I am *Eusebius* reckons those Books not only as *forged*, but as something worse, that is, *absurd* and *impious*.

Ὅσα γε δὴ καὶ νόθοις ἀνδὰ καλαδίκου, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄλογα παντάπασι καὶ δυσσεβῆ παραπτύσσον. lib. 1. c. 25.

3. "When they say that some Writings of the Prophets and Apostles "themselves are not Canonical, and therefore not so, because not ac- "knowledged by the Church to be so. I *Answ.* That some things the Prophets and Apostles might write as private Men, and not by the Inspiration and special direction of the Holy Ghost, and such never were to be received into the Canon of the Scripture, nor were written with any intent that they should. But those things which they writ as Prophets, and as Apostles, by the immediate Inspiration and special direction of the Spirit; and for this end, that they might be the Rule of the Saints Faith, were all received into the Canon: If they deny this, Let them produce any such Writing of Prophets, or Apostles not yet received as Canonical. For what they say out of 1 *Chron.* 29. 29. of the Writings of *Samuel, Nathan* & *Gad*, How will they ever make it evident that they were other than the Books of *Samuel*, written partly by himself while he lived, and partly by *Gad* and *Nathan* after his death? And so likewise, 2 *Chron.* 9. 29. the Writing of *Nathan*, *Ahijah* and *Iddo*, and 2 *Chron.* 13. 22. *Iddo* again, 2. 29, 30. *Jehu*, How will they ever prove them to be other than what we have in the Books of *Kings*? It is true too, that mention is made of some Writings of *Solomon* which are not in the Canon; But how will it appear that they ever ought to be there, or were ever written for that purpose? As for any Writings of the Apostles which are not in the Scripture, the chief insisted on is the Epistles, as they would have it, of *Paul* to the *Laodiceans*, mentioned *Colos.* 4. which we deny to have been written by *Paul*, nor will the words enforce any such thing; the Epistle *from Laodicea* is one thing, and *to Laodicea* another: It is most likely to have been some Letter written by the *Laodiceans* to *Paul*, in which there being some things that concerned the *Colossians*, the Apostle adviseth them to read that Epistle. *Hierom* saith of this Epistle, that some do read it as one of *Pauls*, but *it is generally rejected.* And for other Books which they mention, they have been as generally disowned by the Church as fictitious, and not written by the Authors whose Names they bear. The same Father cashiers several of them together, that went under the Name of *Peter*, as being all *Apocryphal.*

It is in the Greek, Ἐκ Λαοδικείας not πρὸς Λαοδικείας. Παρὰ πάντων ἐκβέβληται, de Script. Eccles.

Ὡς ἀπόκρυφα ὄντα ἀπόδοκιμάζεται. Ibid.

Obj. 4. "We cannot confute Hereticks who deny the Scripture or "part of it, but by the Authority of the Catholick Church, which re- "ceives it.

Answ. Those Hereticks that will acknowledg the Church may be confuted by its Authority, but not have Faith wrought in them; they may have their mouths stop'd, but not their minds enlightned by it. And though we may make use of the Authority of the Church with such, yet not as the chief, and much less only, Argument to perswade them of the Divinity of the Scripture; but even by the same way, whereby Believers are perswaded of it, may Hereticks be perswaded too. And if we meet with such Hereticks as pay no more reverence to the Church, than to the Scripture, we are in a fine case, if we have no other way of

of dealing with them, but by urging the Authority of the Church: surely they that deny the Divinity of the One, will not stick to deride the Testimony of the Other!

Obj. 5. To pass by other Testimonies they cite out of the Ancients, one they mainly triumph in, that saying of *Austin*, "That *he had not* "*believed the Gospel, had not the authority of the Church moved him to it.*

Answ. Austin speaks when converted and Orthodox, of himself as formerly a *Manichee*, and shews that he had then been moved by the Authority of the Church to receive the Gospel: when he was a *Manichee* he was an Heretick, not an Heathen, and so might have some esteem for the Church; or if he had no respect for the Church as the Church, yet he might (even by the Confession of Papists themselves) so far as he saw the Consent of so many Nations, and the Prescription of so long time, and other like Arguments in the Church to induce him to reverence it.

Ego non crederem Evangelio, nisi me Ecclesiæ Catholicæ commoveret Authoritas. Crederem & commoveret *for* credidissem, & commovisset, *as is a frequent way of speaking with that Father.* See *Cham. Panstr.* l. 2. c. 11. at large.

Use 1. From what hath been spoken we may conclude; 1. The mischief and danger of Popery as to this particular Doctrine; How dishonourable and injurious to God is this Doctrine of the Papists, and how destructive to Religion?

1. How dishonourable to God, for the Credit of his Word to depend upon the Testimony of Men, and not to be able of it self to discover its Author?

1. A dishonour it is to his Wisdom, if he could not otherwise assure Men of the Divine Original of the Scripture, than by having Men bear witness to it: If he knew no other way of certifying us of his Will, and making known his Laws to us, but by the help of our fellow-creatures, who as well as we are subject to those Laws. Can God make the Heavens declare his glory, and cannot he make the Scripture do it? Can he make himself *known by the judgments he executes*, and not by the Statutes he establisheth? Can he shew forth his Wisdom, Power and Goodness by the things he doth, and not by the things he speaks, and so make his *Works praise* him, but not his Word? Nay, Can Men so write, so speak, as thereby to discover themselves, and what wisdom, or knowledg, or skill they have, and cannot God do as much? Is God less wise and able than they are, or is he wise in some things, and not in others? How came the *Spirit of the Lord* to be thus *straitned*, as to have but this one way of making known the Word to us, and that such a one as he must be beholden to his Creatures for it? It is certain that formerly he had other ways, And why hath he not now? How comes he to be less wise than he was! Sure if there be no *variableness* in God, nor *shadow of turning*, he must be as unchangeable in his Wisdom as in any other Attribute, and there can be no diminution of it.

Psal. 9. 16.

Psal. 145. 10.

Mic. 2. 7.

Jam. 1. 17.

2. If God can otherwise make known the Divineness of his Word, than by the Testimony of the Church, and yet will not, it looks (to say no worse) very like a reflection upon his Goodness, to leave men

a more uncertain way of coming to the knowledg of his Will, and their Duty, when he could give them a more sure one; to leave his people better helps against their weakness and doubtings, than the uncertain Authority of a Man, or a company of Men, who may as easily be deceived in the Testimony they give, as others may in the Faith they yield to it. And if God did formerly give his people a better and more sure Foundation for their Faith, than the Authority of meer men, weak men, fallible men (as hath been proved), How comes his Goodness to fail now, and to be less to Saints under the Gospel, than to those under the Law, or the Patriarchs before it?

3. This Doctrine of the *Romanists* greatly derogates from Gods Sovereignty, it degrades his Authority, and lifts up the Church into his place; it doth worse than make *Princes* go on foot, and *Servants ride on* Eccles. 10. 7. *Horses*. If what the Papists teach in this Point be true, the Holy Ghost is in a worse condition than his Apostle was, 2 *Cor.* 3. 1. (who needed not *Letters of Commendation to* or *from* the Churches) he must be fain to canvase for the Votes of *men*, or seek their Testimonials; God himself cannot establish his Laws without the Churches leave; Jesus Christ shall not be King of Saints, not sway his Scepter, nor Rule his House without the good-liking of the Pope and Council: What is this but what Tertul. was said of old, *Nisi homini Deus placuerit, Deus non erit*; God must be concerned to please Men, at least the Papists; for if he doth not, they know how to be quit with him; for then He shall not exercise his Authority over them, not bind their Consciences, not command their Faith, not prescribe them their Duty, not govern their Lives: the Church will not give their approbation to his Laws, and so he shall not be their Sovereign, *he shall not be their God*. What can be more injurious to Gods Supremacy than this Doctrine, which subjects the Authority of God in his Word to the pleasure of his Creatures? What Sovereign Prince upon Earth will endure to be so dealt with? to have the Authority of his Laws suspended upon the Testimony of those that publish them, of those that are themselves subject to them? I dare say the Pope scorns to have it said that his Decretals have their force from him that divulgeth them, or his Bulls from him that Posts them up: He would not endure if he sent out his Orders to a Church, or Council, that they should *sit* upon them, and subject them to their judgment, and approve or disallow of them as they saw fit; He would expect that they should be received, and submitted to upon the account of his Stamp upon them, and Seal annexed to them. Why may not the Scripture be allowed as much, which hath Gods Stamp so fairly impressed on it, and had the Seal of so many Miracles to confirm it?

2. This Doctrine of the Papists is prejudicial, indeed destructive to Christian Religion, it leaves us only the name of Christianity and no more. What is all Religion if God be not the Author of it, and if the Papists say true, we can never be sure that God is the Author of

that

that which we call Christian. This one Doctrine of the Romish Synagogue puts us into a worse condition than the Jewish one is in, which hath some Foundation for its Faith and Worship, whereas this leaves none at all for ours. It is in a word most perniciously contrary to, and destructive of a Christian Faith, and Comfort and Obedience all at once.

1. It is destructive to our Faith. It leaves us no firm Footing for it, when it must be *first* founded upon, and *lastly* resolved into the Authority of Men; and we can never know the Scripture to be the Word of God, without either the concurring Votes of all the Christian World to assure us of it, or at least the definitive Sentence of a Pope or Council, and have no better assurance of its being Divine, than their *say-so*. What can ruine our Faith if the undermining of it do not? And what is it to undermine it if this be not? It takes away the very Foundation of it, and instead of the infallible Veracity of the God of Truth, puts us off with the uncertain Testimony of (at least) a Company of Fallible Men, who may every one of them be deceived, and therefore so may we too, for Company, if we relie on their Authority. Indeed it leaves us little (if any at all) more certainty for our Religion than the Turks have for theirs; for Why may not they as well require us to believe that God speaks to us in the *Alcoran*, because they say He doth, as the Papists require us to believe He speaks to us in the Scripture, merely because *the Pope, or Council*, say so? Nay, How little difference doth this cursed Doctrine make between the Great Mysteries of the Gospel, the Articles of our Faith, and the ridiculous Fables of the Rabbines, or Abominations of *Mahomet*? For if some Writings are not Canonical Scripture, merely because the Church (that is, Pope or Council) hath not Canonized them, and some are because it hath; the *Acts of Peter* and the *Revelation of Paul* are not the Word of God, because the Church would not so far Dignifie them, and the *Epistles of Peter and Paul* are therefore of Divine Authority because it so seemed good to the Church to determine, Why might not the same Church, if She had been so pleased, have added the *Talmud* to the Scripture; I and the *Alcoran* too? And they cannot say, it is because these Books contain not only innumerable Fopperies, but notorious Lies, unless they will eat their own Words, and recede from one of their chiefest Arguments, *viz.* That the Apocryphal Books they themselves do not receive, are therefore only not Canonical, because the Church hath not received them, when the rest are because She hath.

2. It is as destructive to our Comfort. When our great Comfort proceeds from our Faith, such as the one is, so will the other be too: an ill-grounded Faith can never produce a well-grounded Comfort: the Foundation being shaken, the Building must needs totter. What will become of that *Comfort of the Scripture* the Apostle speaks of, *Rom.* 15. 4. that *Joy and Peace in Believing*, v. 13. that *Hope in Gods Word* *David* mentions, *Psal.* 119. 81. and 130. 5. If we can no otherwise be sure:

ſure that it is Gods Word, but only becauſe *Men* tell us it is ſo? How will our Hope and Comfort fail us, and our Hearts fail us, when we come to conſider; That that Teſtimony of Man which is the ground of our Faith, and therefore of our Comfort, for ought we know will, ſure enough may, fail us? How ſhould we ſtand if our Foundation ſink under us? If *The Rain ſhould deſcend, and the Floods come, and the Winds blow, and beat* upon us, What Shelter, what Fence ſhould we have? *How great would our Fall be?* If Temptations ſhould ariſe, and aſſault and ſhake our Faith, How ſhould we maintain our Comforts? Would it not be ſad for us, or any of us to ſay within our Selves; 'I have ventured my Soul, and its Eternal Welfare upon the Scripture, 'and the Promiſes I there find, but How do I know that this Scripture 'is the Word of God? How do I know I am not miſtaken? Am I, as 'ſure I am not deceived, as I am certain of being Miſerable if I be? 'Here is indeed a Company of Men that call themſelves the Church; 'but that is a hard Word, I never meet it any-where but in their *mouths*, 'and in this *Book* which they have put into my Hands; and yet theſe are 'the only Men that tell Me it is the Word of God. But What reaſon have 'I to believe them? They ſay indeed they are *Infallible* and cannot be 'deceived, but How ſhall I know that? They ſay the Scripture ſays ſo; 'Suppoſe it doth, What know I but they make it ſay ſo, and the Scrip-'ture, and they are agreed together to gratifie one another, and ſpeak 'for one another? I ſee not that they are the Church unleſs the Scrip-'ture makes them ſo, and yet they tell me, that the Scripture is not the 'Word of God *to me* unleſs they make it ſo. I know no Authority 'they have to bind me to *believe them*, but what this Book gives them, 'and they know none it hath to bind me to *believe it*, but what they 'give it. And thus I am quite at a loſs, if either this thing called the 'Church be not honeſt but *will* cheat me, or be not infallible but *may* 'deceive me; How vain than, and flattering have all my Hopes been 'hitherto, how uncertain my Faith, how deceitful my Joys and Com-'forts! Farewel *Glory, and Honour, and Peace*; farewel *Life and Im-'mortality*; farewel the *Inheritance of the Saints*, and the *Crown of righ-'teouſneſs*; fine things if I knew where to have them. How would you like this Chriſtians? Do ye not even tremble at the thoughts of ſuch diſmal Temptations? What think you then of the Religion of the Papiſts, which expoſeth all that embrace it to ſuch uncertainties; It is no wonder they allow no *certainty of Salvation* to Believers, when they leave them at ſo great *uncertainties* for the very Foundation of their Faith.

Matth. 7.

Rom. 2. 10. 2 Tim. 1. 10. Coloſſ. 1. 12. 2 Tim. 4. 8.

3. It is as deſtructive to our Obedience as to either of the other. Goſpel-evidence is the fruit of Faith; and therefore ſuch as is the Faith we have, ſuch will be the Obedience we yield: If our Faith be not right, our Obedience can be no better: a humane Faith is not ſufficient to found our Duty to God upon, and that Obedience which proceeds only

only from such a Faith, will neither be acceptable to God, nor available to us; and yet such is the Faith, and no higher which causeth our Obedience, if it be grounded only or firstly in the Testimony of Man, and resolved into it. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God*; and that Faith sure is a Divine Faith, such as rests on Gods own Authority: But if we believe the Scripture to be of God, only because Men say it is, that Faith cannot be Divine; and therefore nor the Obedience which flows from it acceptable. In this case the same Testimony of the Church which would be the Foundation of our Faith, would likewise be the cause of our Obedience: We should believe Duty to be Duty, with the same kind of Faith with which we believed the Command of it to be of God, and that would be no other than mens telling us that it is; and so the result of all would be, that we must obey God, because they tell us he commands us to obey him, and so we first shew a respect to Men in believing before we shew any to God in obeying him; And then, not only we must be beholden to the Church for the knowledg we have of our Duty, but God must be beholden to her too for our performing of it.

2. How much a better Religion is ours than that of the Papists? We are the veriest fools upon Earth if ever we change our own for theirs.

1. We have more Certainty in our way than they have, or ever can have in their way. Our Faith is built upon no worse a bottom than the infinite Veracity of him who is the Truth it self, revealing himself to us in the *Scripture of Truth*, and not on the sandy Foundation of any Humane Testimony; It leans upon God, not upon men; upon *Thus saith the Lord*, not *Thus saith the Church*. Though we despise not the true Church, but pay reverence to all that Authority wherewith God hath vested it, yet we dare not set it up in Gods place; we are willing it should be an help to our Faith, but not the Foundation of it, and so should do its own Office, but not invade Gods Seat, nor take his Work out of his hands; that would neither be for his Glory, nor our own Security: Our Faith is a better than such a one would be; We receive it not from Churches, from Popes, from Councils, but from God himself, that cannot lye to us, and will not deceive us. If we are beholden to Men, Parents, Ministers, &c. for putting the Bible into our hands, and directing us to the Scripture; yet when we read it, hear it opened, and are enlightned by it, and see what a Spirit there is in it; When the Word *enters* into us (as the Sun-beams into a dark room) *and gives us light*, Psal. 119. 105. we see its Excellency, are ravished with its beauty, taste its Sweetness, feel its Power, admire its Majesty: When we find it to be such a Word as searcheth our Hearts, judgeth our thoughts, tells us all that is within us, *all that ever we did in our lives*, John 4. 29. awakens our Consciences, commands the most inward Spiritual Obedience, sets before us the noblest Ends, and offers us the most glorious Reward, an unseen one, an Eternal one; Then we come to acknowledg

ledg that *of a truth God is in it*, no meer Creature could be the Author of it; and so we believe it, not because Men have Ministerially led us to the knowledg of it, or have perswaded, or commanded us to receive it, or told us it is of God, but because we our selves have heard, and felt him speaking in it; the Spirit shines into our minds, by the Light of this Word, and speaks loudly to our hearts, by the Power of it, and plainly tells whose Word it is; and so makes us yield to Gods Authority in it. Take a Christian whose Faith is thus bottomed, and overturn it if you can; you must first beat him out of his Senses, perswade him he hath no eyes, no taste, no feeling, no understanding, no affections, no reflection upon himself, no knowledg of what is done in his own soul, and so indeed that he is not a Man, but a brute or a stock, e're ever you can perswade him that the Scripture is not the Word of God. Whereas, on the other side, the Papists Religion is built meerly on Men, and their Faith hath no more Certainty than those Men have Infallibility. Ask them what is the great, nay the only convincing Reason, why they believe the Scripture to be the Word of God: And they will tell you, the Churches Testimony concerning it; they believe it because the Church commends it, that is, the Pope doth so, or a General Council, or some-body they know not who; and here they are at a loss already, for asmuch as they fill our ears with a great noise and din of the Church, and can scarce talk of any thing but *the Church*, *the Church*, yet they are not so much agreed among themselves, what this very Church is upon whose Authority they build their Faith, and would have us build ours; In several Countries they have several *Churches*, several *Supremacies*, several *Infallibilities*; A Council is the *Church*, and *Supreme*, and *Infallible* in *France*, and the Pope is the same in *Italy*, and so (amongst the Papists) if you do but change your *Climate*, you must change your *Faith* too; if you but Cross the *Alps*, you must translate your Faith, and shift it from a Councils shoulders, to the Popes: A strange variable thing you will find it, which must be calculated according to the *Meridian* you are in, and will not serve indifferently for all places; so that you must be sure to *fix* your habitation ere you can *settle* your Belief. And yet if this were agreed upon, you would still be at an uncertainty as to the Infallibility of whatsoever they call the Church; for you are like to have nothing but their own word for it; and if you will take it so, you may; or if they prove it by the Scripture, they desert their Cause, and own the Scripture as above them, and Authentick without them, and so while they would establish their Infallibility they lose their Authority. And so to conclude, there is nothing certain, nothing solid among them, nothing able to bear the weight of an Immortal Soul, nothing upon which a man can venture his Everlasting Salvation. I see no such thing as a truly Divine Faith among them, unless it be therefore *Divine*, because built upon the Authority of their *Lord God the Pope*. They call the Pope *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Principem & Sponsum*; In the Mass at the Election

Election of him, they apply that to him which is ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt, *John* 14. 16. *I will pray the Father, and he will ſend you another Comforter.* And in the time of *Leo* 10. It was diſputed in their Schools, among other Blaſphemies, Whether the Pope were a meer man, or *quaſi Deus*, as it were a God; and Whether he did not partake of both the Natures of Chriſt. *Morn. Myſter. Iniquit.* p. 636.

Our Religion is more Comfortable as well as more Certain. Our Faith being built upon the Truth of God himſelf, and our Comfort upon our Faith, ſo long as our Foundation remains immoveable, we need not fear our Superſtructure. If our Faith have good footing, our Hopes and Comforts will keep their ſtanding. Faith in the Promiſes is that from whence all the Comfort of our hearts, and our *rejoycing in hope of the glory of God* doth proceed; A Chriſtians Joy is *joy in believing*, and his Peace the *peace of God*, and his comforts the comforts of the Holy Ghoſt; but this can never be if our Faith be founded immediately on the Teſtimony of Men, and not of God, or we believe the Promiſes of the Word to be made by God, becauſe Men tell us he made them. So long as we hold to the *ſure Word*, we have ſure Hopes, and ſure Comforts, and no longer; and therefore a Papiſt can never have any *ſtrong conſolation* by his Faith, when his Faith it ſelf hath ſo *weak* a Foundation. How can they ever rejoice in hopes of Heaven, when they believe there is a Heaven with no better a Faith, than they believe a Pope or Council to be Infallible? It is to little purpoſe to ſay, They believe there is a Heaven (ſay the like of other Articles) becauſe God in the Scripture tells them ſo, when they would not have believed one tittle of that very Scripture, if a Pope or a Council had not bid them believe it; for then their Hopes and Comforts are all reſolved into the Authority of this Church (what-ever it be) as well as their Faith is; and both the one and the other reſts not on the real Infallibility of the God of Truth, but on the pretended Infallibility of one ſingle Prelate at *Rome*, or a Convention of them at *Trent*. From ſuch a Foundation for our Faith, and ſuch Comforters of our Conſciences, *The Lord deliver us.* Rom. 5.

By this you may gather what you muſt do if you would be Papiſts; you muſt renounce your Reaſon, and Faith too, if you would embrace their Religion; you muſt enſlave your Conſciences to the Authority of Men, and ſo put out your own eyes that you may ſee with other Mens: you muſt not be built upon the Foundation of the *Apoſtles* and *Prophets*, but of *Popes* and *Councils*, it may be of a ſingle Pope, and ſo hazard your eternal Peace and Welfare on the credit of a Man, who may be himſelf a Murderer, an Adulterer, a Sodomite, a Necromancer, a Blaſphemer, an Heretick, and may be ſo far from being ſaved himſelf, that he may (as ſome Papiſts acknowledg) carry whole *cart-loads of Souls to Hell* with him; yet ſtill he is *Infallible*, an *Infallible Murderer*, an *Infallible Sodomite*, an *Infallible Sorcerer*, &c. And you muſt believe

him to be infallible all this while, by himself or with a Council, or you could not be saved among them. The Church to be sure you must believe, and adore what-ever it be (either representative or virtual), you must not ask a Reason for your Faith neither, but tamely submit to its tyrannical Dictates. And, if it should ever come to this, Would it not be as *hard a Chapter*, as the *third of Daniel*? Would not *Smithfield* be as hot a Place as the Plain of *Dura*, if every one that would not fall down and worship this great Golden Idol, *Holy Church*, should be cast into the burning fiery Furnace.

Use 2. And therefore to prevent this, and That your Faith may be firm, and immoveable, as standing not in the Authority or Wisdom of Men, but the Power and Truth of God; That your Hearts may be full of Comfort, your Lives full of Holiness, your Deaths full of Sweetness, and That you may be more than Conquerors over all those Temptations whereby the Wicked one may at any time assault your Faith; Before to see that it have a good Foundation; see that you believe the Scripture upon solid and lasting Grounds. Trust the Authority of no meer Man, nor Company of Men in the World, in a Business on which the Everlasting Blessedness, or Misery of your Souls doth depend. *Hear Moses and the Prophets*; hear the *Apostles and Evangelists*; We are sure God spake by them, and they never Err; as for Popes and Councils, we are sure they have Err'd, and so may do again, and so may your Parents that first Instructed you. Masters, Teachers, Churches, all may Err, and though *de facto* they do not Err in this, when they tell you the Scripture is the Word of God; yet they being but Men, and having no Promise of absolute Infallibility, and being liable to Mistakes in other things, when you find that, you may come to question whether they were not mistaken in this too, and so think you have been deluded all this while, and taken that for the Word of God, and Rule of your Lives, which is nothing less; and then you will either cast away your Faith, or you must seek a new Foundation for it; and if you come in a Papists way, and hear talk of *Peters* Successors, Christs Vicars, Catholick Churches, General Councils, Infallibilities, long Successions, Apostolical Traditions, you do not know what kind of Spirit such Conjuring Words may raise up in you: You may be apt to think, the Major Part (as you will be told, though falsely, it is) must carry it, and so determine your Faith by the Votes of Men, that is, not so much change the Foundation of it, as enlarge it: And whereas before it was built upon the Credit of a Parent, or a Pastor, now build it upon the Credit of a great Many, or a great One in the Name of all the rest; or if it rested before on a particular Church, now it shall relie on that which you are told is the Catholick one. For my part, I shall never wonder to see ill-grounded Protestants, easily turn Papists: they are semi-Papists already, and they may soon be wholly such; they have a Pope at home, and if they do not like him, they may easily exchange him

him for another abroad: He that pins his Faith upon one Mans sleeve may soon do it upon anothers; he is already a Church-Papist, and may soon be a Mass-one. And therefore, to conclude, Whoever thou art, if thou have not formerly done it, Search thy self now ere Satan sift thee: try thy Faith in the Scripture that it may be approved; see whose Image and Superscription it bears, what Foundation it hath, what *Answer* thou canst give to any one that *asks* thee *a reason of it*, nay, what answer thou canst give thy self. Ask thy self, Why do I believe the Bible to be the Word of God? 'How do I know it was not the Inven-'tion of Man? By what Arguments, by what Authority was I indu-'duced to give my assent to it? Do I take it merely on the credit of 'those of whom I was born, among whom I was bred, with whom 'I have conversed? Is this a sufficient Foundation for my Faith? Dare 'I venture my Soul upon such a Bottom? Is this to build my House 'upon a Rock? How near the Papists am I come ere I was aware of it? 'I spit at them, and defie them, and yet act like them if not below 'them, and can scarce say so much for my Faith as they can for theirs. If this be thy condition, To work a-new for shame, and begin quickly too, and get thy Faith well settled, and upon its right *Basis*, or I dare say thou wilt never keep thy Faith at the expence of thy Life, but rather turn ten times than Burn once. If thou hast therefore any regard to the constancy of thy Faith, to the comfort of thy Life, the honour of God, or the Salvation of thy own Soul, labour immediately to get thy Belief of the Word better founded: Read the Scripture constantly, study it seriously, search it diligently, hear it explained, and applied by others, meditate on it thy self, and beg of God an understanding of it, and a right Faith in it; that he would give thee *an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear*; that he would *Open thine eyes to behold wondrous things out of his Law*; that he would give thee his Spirit, that thou mayst *Search the deep things of God*; that he would cause thee to hear his voice in that Word which thou hast hitherto taken to be His, and direct thy heart into the surest Grounds of believing it. And be sure hold on in such a way of painful endeavours for the getting thy Faith settled, till it be done, and what thou hast hitherto received on the account of Man, thou now believest for the sake of God himself. I deny thee not the Testimony of the Universal Church of Christ in all Ages (so far as thou art capable of knowing it) as well as of the present Church, or any particular One to which thou art any way related, as an help to thee; make the best thou canst of it, only rest not on it: But especially take notice, if thou see not the Stamp of God upon the Word, Characters of Divinity imprinted on it, as well as external Notes accompanying it; Consider the Antiquity of it, the Continuance of it, the Miracles that confirmed it, the condition of the Men that penn'd it, their Aims, their Carriage and Conversation, Gods Providence in keeping it, and handing it down to thee through so many successive Gene-

Deut. 29. 4. Psal. 119. 18.

1 Cor. 2. 10.

rations,

rations, when ſo many in all Ages would have bereaved the World of it: And further, Conſider the Majeſty and Gravity, and yet Plainneſs and Simplicity of its Stile, the Depth of the Myſteries it diſcovers, the Truth and Divineneſs of the Doctrine it teacheth, the Spirituality of the Duties it enjoyns, the Power and Force of the Arguments with which it perſwades, the Eternity of the Rewards it promiſes, and the Puniſhments it threatens, the End and Scope of the whole, to reform the World, to diſcountenance and extirpate Wickedneſs, and promote Holineſs and Righteouſneſs, and thereby advance Gods Glory, and lead Man on to everlaſting Bleſſedneſs, *&c.* And be ſure leave not off, till thou find thy Faith raiſed from ſo low a bottom as the Authority of Men, and fix'd on Gods own Teſtimony; till thou canſt ſafely and boldly ſay, 'I believe the Scripture now to be the Word of God, not 'becauſe I have heard Men ſay ſo, but becauſe I hear God himſelf in this 'very Scripture bearing witneſs to it; his Spirit hath given me new 'Eyes, and enabled me to ſee the Divineneſs of it: *I know and am ſure* 'That this is the Word of God, never mere Man ſpake at ſuch a rate, 'never did the Word of Man work ſuch effects. The *entrance of it* hath '*given light* to my Soul which was before in darkneſs, not knowing whi-'ther it went. How many glorious Myſteries do I ſee in it, what Pu-'rity, what Spirituality, what Holineſs, *&c.* all which ſpeak the Wiſ-'dom, and Power, and Goodneſs, and Holineſs, and Truth of the 'Author of it? What Sweetneſs have I taſted in it? It hath been as Pſal. 19. 'the *Hony and hony-comb* to me: What Power, what Life, what ſtrange 'Energy have I experienced in it? What a Change hath it wrought in 'me! What Luſts hath it diſcovered and mortified! What Duties hath it 'convinced me of, and engaged me in! What Strength hath it furniſhed 'me with! How hath it quickened me when I was dead in Sin, revived 'my Comforts when they were dying, actuated my Graces when they 'were languiſhing, rouzed me up when I was ſluggiſh, awaked me 'when I was dreaming, refreſhed me when I was ſorrowful, ſupported 'me when I was ſinking, anſwered my Doubts, conquered my Tempta-'tions, ſcattered my Fears, enlarged me with Deſires, and filled me with 1 Pet. 1. 8. '*Joy unſpeakable and full of glory*! And what Word could ever have 'wrought ſuch effects, but that of the Eternal, all-Wiſe, all-Powerful 'God? And therefore upon his alone Authority I receive it, Him alone 'I adore in it, whoſe Power I have ſo often found working by it. I 'durſt venture an hundred Souls if I had them, and an hundred Hea-'vens if there were ſo many, upon the Truth and Divine Authority 'of this Word; and ſhould not ſtick, not only to give the Lie to the Such Titles the Papiſts give their Schoolmen. 'moſt *Profound*, and moſt *Reſolute*, and *Invincible*, and *Irrefragable*, 'and *Angelical* and *Seraphical* Doctors, nay and *Infallible* Popes, and 'Councils too, but even to ſay *Anathema* to Angels themſelves, and 'Seraphims, if they ſhould tell me the Scripture were not the Word 'of God. Chriſtian, get but ſuch a Faith of the Word as this into thy

Heart,

Heart, and then thou mayeſt deſie Scoffers, Atheiſts, Papiſts, and all their Works. If they deride thee, let them mock on; thou wilt not eaſily be laughed out of thy Senſes, nor overcom by Mens Jeers to diſbelieve what thou haſt ſeen and felt. If they will not believe as thou doſt, yet thou ſhalt never be brought to play the Infidel as they do; no more than ceaſe to behold, and admire the glory of the Sun, becauſe Birds of the Night, Owls and Bats, care not for looking on it; thou wilt never deny what thou plainly ſeeſt, becauſe others do not who have no Eyes. Sure I am, if they ſee not what thou doſt, it is either becauſe they wink againſt the Light, or look off from it, or God hath not yet in Mercy opened their Eyes, or hath in Judgment cloſed them up; *If our Goſpel be hid, it is hid to them that are loſt.* 2 Cor. 4. 3.

SER-

SERMON XI.

Whether the good Works of Believers be Meritorious of Eternal Salvation? *Neg.*

Pſalm 62. 12. *Alſo to thee, O Lord, belongeth Mercy: for Thou rendreſt to every man according to his work.*

THere is ſcarce any ſin more natural to us than Pride, and no Pride worſe than ſpiritual Pride; it was the condemnation of the Devil; and ſpiritual Pride ſhews it ſelf moſt of all in thoſe high and overweening thoughts we are apt to have of our own worth and excellency: Though when we have done evil we are filled with guilt, yet if we but think we have done well, we are tickled with conceit; one while we are conſcious we have offended God, another while we are ready to believe we have obliged him. We can ſcarce be enlarged in a duty, pray with any life or warmth, hear with attention and affection, but we are ready to take our Lords words out of his mouth, and greet our ſelves with a *Well done good and faithful Servant.* And that too not only, as if the work were wholly our own, but as if we had deſerved ſomething by it. We commonly contend with the Papiſts about the Antiquity of our Religion; they bear us in hand that theirs is the more ancient; for my part, I readily grant it in this ſenſe, that Popery, as to ſeveral of the chief points of it, is plainly the Religion of corrupt nature, and nature hath the ſtart of grace in the beſt of us. Men are generally born with a Pope in their bellies, and they can never be eaſed of him, till ſome powerful conviction of the inſufficiency of their own righteouſneſs, and the impoſſibility of meriting Salvation by it, like ſtrong Phyſick make them diſgorge themſelves, and bring him up: And if the doctrine of merits be in the Papiſts only, their Faith, yet it is in carnal Proteſtants, their Nature, and in Saints themſelves, may ſometimes be their temptation. And therefore, Chriſtians, though my preſent buſineſs lie mainly with them of the Romiſh Religion; yet do not you look upon your ſelves as altogether unconcerned;

Mat. 25.

The moſt violent aſſault Mr. *Knox* ever had from Satan was at his dying hour, when he was tempted to think that by his faithfulneſs in his Miniſtry, he had merited Heaven it ſelf. *Vid. Melch. Adam. in vita Knoxi.*

but remember that the ſame Arguments which conclude directly againſt the Pope without you, may at the ſame time be levelled againſt the Pope within you. And the truth of it is, that acquaintance with your ſelves, and the conſtitution of your own ſouls, is the beſt way to eſtabliſh you againſt the moſt dangerous errours of Popery, and the better you can deal with that little young Antichriſt in your hearts, the better you will be able to defend your ſelves againſt that great old one at *Rome*. And that I may help you ſo to do as God ſhall enable me, I have choſen this Text, which I the rather fix upon, becauſe I find it in the head of a whole ſquadron of Scriptures, preſſed by *Bellarmine* into the Popes ſervice: his Holineſs his Commiſſion you know can compel any Scripture to maintain the Catholick Cauſe, though againſt its own conſent. I ſhall endeavour in the progreſs of my diſcourſe, to reſcue both this, and others from the injury of an involuntary warfare, in which they are forced to fight againſt that truth, which God commiſſioned them to defend. If we look into the body of this Pſalm, we ſhall find the royal Pen-man of it, once and again, declaring and profeſſing his faith and confidence in God, and him only, *ver.* 1, 2, 5, 6, 7: in deſpight of all his enemies oppoſition againſt him, over whoſe power he doth triumphantly inſult, *ver.* 3. as well as tax their malice, *ver.* 4. and perſwades others to the like fixing their faith on God, *ver.* 8. labouring to take them off from their falſe and ill-grounded confidences, whether in perſons or things, either as wicked or vain, *ver.* 9. 10. and then lays down the reaſons and grounds of the boldneſs of his faith, Gods power, *ver.* 11. and his mercy, *ver.* 12. one ſhewing his ſufficiency, and ability to overtop all thoſe enemies, and effectually to ſave, the other his readineſs ſo to do for all that do thus truſt in him, and wait for him. The latter of theſe, Gods mercy, he ſets forth by a moſt eminent inſtance of it, that moſt glorious retribution he makes to thoſe that do believe and obey him. *Alſo to thee, O Lord, belongeth Mercy: for thou rendereſt to every man according to his work.*

And ſo the words do both aſſert that great Attribute of Mercy in God, and prove it; the one in the former part of the verſe, *To thee, O Lord, belongeth Mercy*: the other in the latter, *for thou rendereſt to every man according to his work.* The great day of recompenſing men according to what they have done in the fleſh, will be the moſt ample proof, and illuſtrious manifeſtation not only of the righteous, but merciful nature of God.

Enquire we here what is meant by Work, and what by rewarding men according to it.

1. By Work we are not to underſtand barely one individual work; but (the ſingular number being put for the plural) a plurality, or complection of works, of the ſame kind, which altogether make up one integral work. All the particular actions men do of the ſame kind are but parts of the great work they are doing, either for God, or the

the Devil, and so are all included in it. And the miscarriages of Gods children, are so many haltings in their course, so many bunglings in their work, which are blemishes in it, though not absolute interruptions of it.

But if it be farther enquired, what kind of Work or Works is here intended? I answer, good ones, especially; for in the rewarding of them it is that Gods goodness and mercy so greatly appears, when it is plainly enough his justice that is manifested in the recompensing of evil ones. Or we may thus Paraphrase the words; To thee O Lord belongeth mercy, in that thou rendrest to every man according to his work, not only evil to them that do evil and have deserved it, but good to them that do good, though they cannot challenge it.

2. By rewarding men according to their works, (briefly, because I shall meet with it again) I understand Gods recompensing men according to the nature, or kind, or quality of their works: such as their works have been, such shall be their reward, Rom. 2. 6, 7, 8, 9. *Who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life. But to them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath*, &c. And so the proportion is between the kind of work, and the kind of reward. Where the work was good the reward shall be suitable; and where the work was evil the reward will be answerable. Natural good the reward of Moral, as natural evil the reward of Moral evil, *Isa.* 3. 10, 11. If it be *well* with *the righteous* and *ill* with *the wicked*, who can say but the reward is according to their works, though the righteous mans reward be a thousand times greater than his work? Here is therefore a likeness of *quality* between the work and the reward, but not a proportion of *equality*.

Quia ut reddat unicuique juxta opera sua; bona bonis, mala malis: damnas peccatores, remuneras justos. Hierony. in Ps. 62. *qui apud illum est* 61.

Est igitur inter opera & præmia similitudo qualitatis, non proportio equalitatis. Daven. *de justitia.* Act. C. 60.

Doctr. The truth then we infer from the words thus explained, is this, *That the reward of good works is not deserved by them that receive it*: Or, That the best of men by their best works, do not merit the reward that God gives them. If the consequence of this doctrine from the Text be questioned, it may thus be proved. That which is meerly out of the mercy of the rewarder, cannot be for the merit of the worker, Rom. 11. 6. *And if it be by grace, then is it no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace: But if it be of works, then is it no more of grace, otherwise work is no more work.* But the Psalmist here affirms, that the reward of good works is out of the mercy of the rewarder: and therefore it follows, that it is not for the merit of the worker. And so I come to the business in hand, to shew you that good works do not merit eternal life, that being the reward spoken of by the Pen-man of this Psalm. Here we must,

1. Explain the terms of the Question.
2. Give you the State of it.

3. Confirm the Truth.
4. Take off Objections.
5. Make Application.

1: For explication of the terms, it would be enquired into,

1. What is meant by good works? *Answ.* Not to wrong our Adversaries, they themselves do generally understand such good works as are wrought by them that are furnished with truth of Grace, or a supernatural principle suted to, and productive of supernatural actings: such good works as are the vital actions of the new man, the motions of that *Divine nature* whereof believers are *made partakers*. And indeed those works which proceed not from such a principle can be but equivocally called good, as not partaking of the nature of that which is truly, *i. e.* supernaturally good: And of those only we are here to speak, and not of any such as are antecedent to the first grace, or conversion of the heart to God. But when we speak of these good works, we mean not only those of the second Table, works of justice, Charity, Bounty, though the Papists like them best, at least when done to themselves: they must needs be eminently good, which bring in good mony to the Popes coffers, and good chear to the Priests bellies: But we take them more largely and comprehensively, for the duties of both Tables, and those too not only external, or such as are performed by the outward man, but likewise for the inward actings of this supernatural principle which yet proceed no farther than the heart, such as the inward workings of love, thankfulness, hope, joy, humility, patience, *&c.* And in a word, all that good fruit of all kinds, which grows upon this good root.

Bellarm. requires to a meritorious work, that it proceed from one who is *Amicus et gratus Deo*, and then *ex charitatis virtute*. De Justific. l. 5. c. 10. Pet. 2. 3, 4.

This principle always accompanies Faith, without which no works are to be called good. *Et si bona videatur facere, tamen quia sine fide facit, nec bona sunt vocanda.* Aug. in Ps. 31.

2. What we are to understand by Meriting. What is the Original signification of the words *Mereri* and *Meritum* I shall not stand to enquire, but that which is most in use in our present age, and which the Papists for the advantage of their cause make most use of, is expressed in English by *deserving* and *desert*. But if we look back to former times, we shall find these words taken in a far different sense by the Ancient Fathers, (to say nothing of Heathen Writers) than by modern Papists. The Fathers commonly take *mereri*, to merit, for the same as *consequi*, *obtinere*, to obtain, or gain, and *meritum* merit; for any good work which according to Gods appointment is rewardable with eternal life: though in the other, and more strict acceptation of the word it be no merit, as not being truly worthy of the reward; and so to *merit* eternal life is in their sense no more than to do those things which are the way wherein eternal life is to be obtained. And this is evident in that they apply the word Merit to those actions in which any real desert, or proper worthiness of the reward, can never be rationally imagined. Thus *Augustin* frequently, one while he tells us that the Worshippers of Devils are said to *Merit* certain temporal comforts: Elsewhere, that the Virgin *Mary merited*

Cultores dæmonum dicuntur mereri temporalia quædam solatia. de Civit. Dei. l. 5. C. 24. *Maria concipere et parere meruit eum, quem constat nullum habu-*

merited to Conceive, and bring forth Chriſt. And again, that *Paul* by ſo many perſecutions and blaſphemies, *merited* to be called a choſen veſſel. And yet again that the people of *Iſrael* had a ſtiff neck, for that they merited to be delivered from their bondage by ſo many miracles. And I find a paſſage cited of *Auſtin*, which, if merit be taken in the preſent Popiſh notion, all the world cannot reconcile to ſenſe. *Nullis præcedentibus meritis per gratiam dei meruimus templi dei fieri*, By no antecedent merits, we by the grace of God merited to become the Temples of God. And can a man *merit* without *merits*? deſerve without deſerts? If he have no merits properly ſo called, he cannot properly *merit* to become the Temple of God; but without *merits* he may obtain this favour of God. And yet more ſtrange is that expreſſion, whoever is the Author of it, which ſome tell us is ſtill ſung in the Roman Rituals, where ſpeaking of *Adams* ſin, it is ſaid to be *Fœlix culpa quæ tantum meruit habere redemptorem.* A happy tranſgreſſion which *merited* ſo great a Redeemer. And will any believe that *Adams* ſin deſerved ſo well at Gods hands? Was Chriſts coming into the World to redeem ſinners, the reward of ſin, or the remedy againſt it? and yet the reward of it, it muſt be, if the word *meriting* be taken in its proper ſenſe. The ſame way the word is taken by others of the Fathers. *If they, i. e.* the Iſraelites (ſaith *Ambroſe*) *did not merit to come into the land, becauſe they murmured againſt God: How ſhall we merit to come into Heaven, when we live ſo like the Heathen?* And *Cyprian* ſpeaking of *Dorcas* being raiſed from the dead, *ſhe* (ſaith he) *who miniſtred help to the afflicted Widows that they might live, merited to be called back to life at the Prayers of Widows.* In the ſame Catachreſtical way we ſometimes find the word uſed in the vulgar tranſlation, *Joſh.* 11. 20. we read it, *That they might find no favour:* the vulgar hath it, *that they might not merit any mercy.* And Gen. 4. 13. *My puniſhment is greater than I can bear.* Our Margin reads it, *Mine iniquity is greater than that it may be forgiven*: but the vulgar, *Mine iniquity is greater than that I ſhould merit forgiveneſs.* What can meriting in theſe places ſignifie, but obtaining a ſignification very far differing from that in which the Papiſts now take it? *Uſus* is *norma loquendi*, Words are to be taken as they are uſed; and who knows not that words have their modes and faſhions, as well as mens habits and manners? and ſo thoſe which are in faſhion in one age, are quite out in another, or taken quite in a different ſenſe, and ſometimes the Metaphorical ſignification of a word may be more in uſe than the proper; and we ſhall make ſtrange confuſion in the nature of *things*, if thoſe words which properly ſignifie thoſe things, be always taken in their proper ſenſe. I inſiſt the more in this, becauſe it is all the Anſwer I intend to the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, which the Papiſts think to run us down with.

iſſe peccatum. de Nat. & Grat. c. 36. *qui* (*de Paulo loquitur*) *pro tot perſecutionibus et blaſphemiis, vas electionis meruit nominari.* de Predeſt. & grat. c. 16. *et paulo ante, dura cervix in illo populo qui ex omni Mundo electus eſt, qui de ſervitute decem miraculis meruit liberari.*

Chamier. & Rivet. Orthod. Cathol.

Si illi terram intrare non meruerunt, qui murmurati ſunt contra Deum, quomodo Nos Cœlum mereb-imur intrare, indifferenter viventes, ſicut Gentes. Amb. in 4. ad Hebr.

Vse laborantibus viduis largita fuerat ſubſidia vivendi, meruit ad vitam petitione viduarum revocari. Cypr. de Op. & Eleemoſ.

Et non mererentur ullam clementiam.

Major eſt iniquitas mea, quam ut veniam mereat.

But

But to paſs from the word to the thing: if we enquire into the Pedigree of this darling doctrine of the Papiſts, we may eaſily derive it (to look no higher) from their Great-grand-fathers the Phariſaical Jews, from whom they have received a great part of their Religion: The Phariſees were for infallibility, and a Magiſterial impoſing ſpirit in matters of Conſcience before the Pope was born; and the Rabbines were for Tradition before there were any Papiſts in the World: And as for Merits, *Camero* cites a paſſage out of *Maimonides*, where he ſays, *That every man hath his ſins, and every man his Merits, and he that hath more Merits than ſins, is a juſt man, but he that hath more ſins than Merits is a wicked man.* And that learned Author, as well as others, is of opinion that the Apoſtle *James* hath an eye to this errour of the Phariſees, when he ſays, *Chap.* 2. *ver.* 10. *That whoever offends the Law in one point is guilty of all.*

צל-נה תורהשב Vid. Buxt. Synag. Jud. & Petr. Galetine. l. 1. c. 1. Camero in Matth. 19. 3. oper. 170. Burgens. apud Drus.

Others tell us of ſeven ſorts or degrees of Phariſees among the Jews, one of which had its name from their profeſſing to do all ſtill that was required of them, or asking, Was any more yet to be done? like the young man, Mat. 19. 20. *All theſe have I kept from my youth, what lack I yet?* And indeed we need go no farther than our Saviours frequent reflections upon them, and the Apoſtles ſmart diſputations againſt them, in the point of juſtification. But from whence ſoever the Papiſts have received this doctrine of Merits, thus they mannage it: Merit, ſay they, is twofold, One out of *Congruity*, the other out of *Condignity*: The former is a work to which the reward is not due out of juſtice, but out of ſome kind of decency, or congruity; or as ſome of them ſpeak, out of the liberality of the perſon who accepts the work; ſo that though the work do not really merit the reward, and is not proportioned to it, yet there is ſome kind of meetneſs or congruity that it ſhould be rewarded. This kind of merit ſome of them contend to be found in men while in their natural ſtate, in relation to that grace which is afterward beſtowed on them, or wrought in them: But others of themſelves do as ſtifly oppoſe it, and maintain that ſinners cannot even in this way merit the firſt grace, nor the pardon of their ſins, and that believers when fallen from grace (as they ſuppoſe they may) cannot merit their own recovery. But this is not the Merit we are to ſpeak of; The other is that which is out of condignity, which *Durand* diſtinguiſheth into two kinds: One taken more largely for a work of that dignity or goodneſs which is according to Gods appointment required in it, that it may be rewardable with eternal life; and that is no more really than the graciouſneſs, or ſupernatural goodneſs of the Action, as proceeding from a ſupernatural principle, and ordered to a ſupernatural end, which we acknowledge muſt be in every good work which is capable of a ſupernatural reward, and is to be found in every truly gracious action. But there is a Merit

מה חובתי פרוש *Phariſæus qui dicit, quid debeo facere et faciam illud*, q.d. *quid fieri oportet quod non feci?* Druſ. de trib. Sect. Jud. l. 2. c. 22. & Horting. Theſaur. l. 1. c. 1. Luk. 18. 9. & 16. 15. Rom. 10. 3.

Di Alvar: de Auxil diſp. 59. Franc. Cumel. in 1. 2. & 1. Thom. diſp. 5. ſect. 3. In Sent. l. 2. dict. 27. q. 2.

Eſt actio voluntaria propter quam debetur alicui merces ex juſtitia, ſic ut ſi non reddatur, ille ad quem pertinet reddere, injuſte facit, et eſt ſimpliciter ac proprie injuſtus. Durand. ibid.

out

out of Condignity in a more strict sense, which is defined to be *A voluntary action for which a reward is due to a man out of Justice, so that it cannot be denyed him without injustice.* Others define it much after the same manner, *viz.* such an action as hath an equality of dignity or worth in relation to the reward, which is therefore due to it out of justice. And this is the merit we are to speak of, to say nothing of that third kind some add, Merit upon supposition of a promise, as when a reward is promised to a man if he do some work, which yet bears no proportion to that reward, and for which antecedently to the promise he could not challenge any, but such a promise being made, he may, and consequently (say they) may be said to Merit.

Meritum ex pacto.

The Question then is between us, and the Papists, *Whether the good works of believers, such as God doth reward in the future life, do truly and properly deserve that reward, so that it is due out of justice, and God should be unrighteous if he should deny, or refuse it?* The modern Papists generally affirm it. The council of *Trent* so lays down the judgment of the present Church of *Rome*, as to assert that good works do *truly merit eternal life*, and anathematize any that shall say the contrary.

2. The state of the Question.

Cum enim ille ipse Jesus Christus, tanquam caput in membra, et tanquam vites in palmites, in ipsos justificatos jugiter virtutem influat, quæ virtus bona ipsorum opera semper antecedit, comitatur et subsequitur, et sine qua nullo pacto Deo grata et meritoria esse possent, nihil amplius ipsis justificatis deesse credendum est, quo minus plene illis quidam operibus quæ in Deo facta sunt, divinæ legi, pro hujus vitæ statu, satisfeciſſe, et vitam æternam suo etiam tempore, si tamen in gratia decesserint, consequendam, vere promeruisse censeantur. Sess. 6. Cap. 16. *Si quis dixerit hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita, aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus & non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ vitam æternam,* &c. Anathema sit. Can. 32.

And though those cunning Fathers speak somewhat darkly, and so involve things, blending truth with error, as if they designed to make younger brothers of all the World beside, yet the great interpreter of Counsel speaks more honestly, that is more broadly, and plainly tells us, *That eternal blessedness is no less due to the good works of good men, than eternal torments are to the evil works of wicked men.* And that *eternal life is so the recompence of good works, that it is not so much given of God freely, and out of Liberality, as it is out of debt*: And that *the nature of Merit and grace not being consistent, the reward is to be reckoned, not as of grace but of debt.* Now well fare *Andredius* for a plain dealing Enemy; it is a commendable quality in any, but a rare one in a Papist; the man saves us the labour of guessing at the Councils meaning, had all spoke out like him, we should more easily have understood them, and fewer would have been deluded by them: And yet not to wrong any, other modern Jesuits are no less rigid in the point than this Author, nay who among the Papists do not assert the worthiness of good works in relation to the reward, though they are not yet agreed from whence

Andred. apud Chamier.

that

that worthineſs ſhould ariſe: Some ſay as (*Bellarmine* tells us) from the promiſe of God engaging to reward them; but theſe are few, and too modeſt, and inded half Hereticks for their pains. Others ſay from the intrinſick worth, and excellency of the works themſelves, ſetting aſide the conſideration of the promiſe. Theſe are the impudent children of Holy Church, fit Sons for ſuch a Mother. And yet the Cardinal himſelf comes little behind them, if at all; he is of opinion, that the good works of righteous men are worthy of Eternal glory, partly by reaſon of their own proper goodneſs, and partly by virtue of Gods promiſe; yet *not ſo* neither (for he is afraid of ſpeaking too dimmutively of good works) *as if without Gods covenanting with the worker, and acceptance of the work, it did not it ſelf bear an anſwerable proportion to eternal life; but* (only) *becauſe, ſetting aſide the promiſe, God is not obliged to accept a good work to eternal life, though it be equal to it.* To theſe we may add others, who ſay good works are worthy of eternal life, as they are *tincta ſanguine Chriſti*, dip'd in Chriſts blood, dignified and commended by his merits, from which they receive virtue and power, to be themſelves meritorious. And ſo our buſineſs is to ſhew that good works do not on any account, either of themſelves, and their own internal excellency, or of Gods promiſe, or Chriſts Merits deſerve eternal life. And ſo we came to confirm the truth.

Ratio meriti complete eſt ex ordinatione voluntatis divinæ illius actus ad præmium. Soto. in Sentext. c. 1. dict. 17. & paulo poſt. *Actu voluntatis ſuæ (Deus) ordinando ipſum (actum humanum) ad præmium, voluit ipſum eſſe meritum, qui ſecundum ſe conſideratus abſque tali acceptatione divina, ſecundum ſtrictam juſtitiam non fuiſſet dignus tali præmio. Opera juſtorum ſunt meritoria vitæ æternæ de condigna ratione pacti, et operis ſimul non quidam quod ſine pacto vel acceptatione non habetat opus bonum proportionem ad vitam æternam. Sed quia non tenetur [illegible] acceptare ad illam merc[illegible]m opus bonum, quamvis par et æquale mercedi, niſi converſio intercedat.* Bellarm. de juſtif. l. 5. c. 17. Vid. Catech. Rom. p. 412.

Arg. 1. Good works are rewarded meerly out of Gods mercy and grace, and therefore not out of mans merit. What more oppoſit than Mercy, and Merit? Tit. 3. 5. *Not by works of righteouſneſs, but of his mercy he ſaved us.* What a man doth really deſerve by his works, cannot be ſaid to be given him out of meer mercy and grace. But it is from thence only that the beſt works of Gods children are ever rewarded with eternal bleſſedneſs. Thus the Text, *To thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, for thou rendereſt to every man according to his work.* Were not God infinite in mercy, the beſt Saint upon earth would fall ſhort of a reward in heaven. Jude 21. *Looking for the Mercy of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt unto Eternal life.* 1 Pet. 1. 13. *Hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt.* And *Paul* prays for *Oneſiphorus*, 2 Tim. 1. 18. *That he might find mercy of the Lord in that day*, the great day of retribution. The reward then that theſe Saints expected, and would have others look for, is one given them out

Inter mercedem et meritum eſt quidam reſpectus mutuus &c. utrumque autem habet quandam oppoſitionem ad gratiam ſive donum gratuitam. Janſen. Iprens. de grat. primi hominis. c. 16.

Εἰ δὲ ὑποίσουσι τινὲς τοῦτον παραδέξασθαι διὰ χάριν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς. Εἰ μὴ ἕνεκα τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἦλθε λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἐξέτασιν, πάντας ἂν εὕροι ἐνόχους αὐτῶν. Chryſoſt. in Pſal. 130.

of

of Mercy. Men never need mercy more than when they come before Gods Tribunal, and even there when they look for the reward of their good works, they muſt expect it from the mercy of the Judge. So *Nehemiah* did, who after making mention of ſome of his good works, and praying that God would remember him for them, chap. 13. ver. 14. he farther prayes that God would *ſpare him according to the greatneſs of his mercy*, ver. 22. Now when is it that *Nehemiah* deſires to be ſpared, but then when he expects his works ſhould be rewarded? Gods ſparing extends even to his judging. Gods remembring him for good, *ver.* 31. his not wiping out his good deeds, and his ſparing him, all proceed from the ſame mercy of God. But eternal life (ſay the Papiſts) is aſcribed *Exc.* to Gods mercy, not that it is not truly, and properly the reward of mans Merits, but that thoſe merits themſelves are the fruits of Gods mercy. To which we may eaſily reply, that if God do out of his mer- *Anſw.* cy ſave us, and out of mercy remember us for good, and reward us according to our work, then it is clear that he doth not only enable us out of his mercy, to do thoſe good works which tend to Salvation. It is one thing for a man to be ſaved, another thing to be put into a way of Salvation by being enabled to work for it. As it is one thing to crown a man for conquering, and another to give him weapons & teach him to fight. God could not be truly ſaid to ſave any man, if he only gave him grace to work in order to it: Nor to ſave him out of mercy, if for all that mercy he muſt ſtill be ſaved by his merits, and without them, might fall ſhort of Salvation.

Neque ſervatus (eſt) ex miſericordia, cui tam fiat poſt eam miſerecordiam neceſſaria merita, ut poſſit illa abſque his fieri irrita. Cham. Panch. l. 14. c. 14. To. 3.

Arg. 2. Eternal life is the gift of God, and therefore is not deſerved by our good works, Luk. 12. 32, *It is your Fathers good pleaſure to give you the Kingdom.* Rom. 6. 23, *The wages of ſin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life.* That therefore Eternal life is a gift none can deny, that will not deny the plain words of Scripture: And that then it will follow, that good works do not deſerve it, will appear by the oppoſition that there is between a free gift, and a due reward: that which is of grace is not of debt, and that which is of debt is not of grace, *Rom.* 11. 6. What I owe, I cannot be ſaid properly to give, and what I properly give, I cannot be ſaid to owe. So that if God properly gives Eternal life, he cannot be ſaid to owe it, and if he do not owe it, I am ſure we do not deſerve it. So much we ſee in the Apoſtles Antitheſis, the wages of ſin is death; death is truly and properly the wages of ſin, as being deſerved by us, and it is juſtice in God to give us our deſert. But he doth not ſay, Eternal life is the wages of our righteouſneſs or works, but the gift of God, as being free, and altogether undeſerved by us. Ὀψώνια, *Stipendium*, he alludes to the *pay* that was given to Souldiers in the Wars, and for which they had ſerved. *Luk.* 3. 14.

ὀψώνιον.
Stipendium peccati mors. Recte ſtipendium, quia debetur, quia digne retribuitur, quia merito redditur deinde ne juſtitia humana de humano ſe extolleret bono merito, &c. non e contrario retulit, ſtipendium juſtitiæ vita æterna, ſed Dei gratia vita æterna. Aug. contra Pelag. Epiſt. 105.
Malluit dicere gratia Dei vita æterna, ut intelligeremus, non pro meritis noſtris Deum nos ad vitam æternam, ſed pro ſua miſeratione perducere. Aug. de grat. & lib. Arb.

Luk. 7. 42. When they had nothing to pay he frankly forgave them both. ἐχαρίσατο.

οὐκ εἶπεν ἡ ἀντιμισθία ἡ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὸ χάρισμα, ὃ γὰρ ἀμοιβὴν καὶ ἀντίδοσιν οὐκ ἐλάβετε, ἀλλὰ χάριτι πάντα ἐγένετο ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. In Sext. c. ad Rom.

Be content with your wages ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς ὀψωνίοις ὑμῶν. But Eternal life he calls χάρισμα the free gift of God, such an one as is given, ἐκ χάριτος out of grace, as Souldiers sometimes were wont to have gifts, *donativa* largesses, given them over and above their pay, as we know was the frequent practice of the Roman Emperours to do, unto which it is not unlikely that our Apostle may allude in the latter part of the verse, as well as he plainly enough doth to their pay in the former. *The Apostle doth not say eternal life is your wages* (says Theophylact) *but Gods gift, for you receive not the compensation, and remuneration of your labours, but all these things come by grace through Jesus Christ.*

Arg. 3. Eternal life is given to believers by way of Inheritance, and therefore not by way of Merit, Eph. 1. 14, *Which is the earnest of our inheritance.* Rom. 8. 17, *If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joynt heirs with Christ.* Heb. 1. 14. *Who shall be heirs of Salvation.* This none can deny. And that it follows that if they be heirs of glory, they have it not by the merit of their works, we see by Tit. 3. 5, 7. *Not by works of righteousness*, &c. *that being justified by his grace we should be made heirs*, &c. Gal. 3. 18. *If the inheritance be of the Law it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise.* To have eternal life by the Law and by works, is opposed to our having it by promise, and by inheritance. And this may be farther confirmed; for if a believer merit his inheritance, then either he doth it by works done before his Adoption, which Papists themselves will not say, who acknowledge eternal life not to be the wages of servants, but the portion of children, and that merits cannot be in any who are not reconciled to God, and accepted of him: Or else it must be by works done after a man is adopted; but that cannot be neither, because whoever merits, doth thereby acquire a right to something to which he had none before, whereas every believer hath a right to the heavenly inheritance by his very Adoption, and before those good works be wrought, whereby it is pretended he merits it. Rom. 8. 17. *If children, then heirs*, &c. But say the Papists, believers have a right to heaven by their adoption, yet must merit the actual possession of it. It is subtilly distinguished: as if an adopted person had not a title to the possession of the inheritance the very first moment he is adopted, or as if a man might have a right to heaven, and yet not have a right to the possession of it. We acknowledge that obedience is required in a Son before he come to possess his Inheritance, yet that obedience though antecedent to his possessing that inheritance, is only the way in which he is to come to it, and the means whereby he is to be fitted for it, but is not meritorious of it; there is no right to the Inheritance required by his obedience which before he had not, though farther fitness for, and suitableness to it there may be. The Israelites were to fight, and subdue their enemies ere they possessed the promised Land, but their right to the possession of it they had before by the promise; and who can say that they were worthy of it meerly because they fought for it?

Exc.

Answ.

Arg. 4.

Arg. 4. Believers owe all to God, and therefore can merit nothing of him: they owe all to God, both as being his ſervants to whom they are bound, and his beneficiaries who have received all from him.

1. They are his ſervants, Luk. 17. 10. *Say we are unprofitable ſervants.* 1 Cor. 6. 19, 20. *Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price*; what that price is *Peter* tells us, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. not corruptible things, gold, ſilver, but *the precious blood of Chriſt*, &c. All the Creatures are his ſervants, becauſe made, and employed, and maintained by him: but believers are more eſpecially his ſervants, becauſe they are redeemed by him too, from being ſervants to ſin and Satan (by whom, though they were never rightfully Servants, yet they were held in bondage) and purchaſed by him to be his own poſſeſſion, his peculiar people, and to do his work, to be *zealous of good works*, Tit. 2. 14. I ſuppoſe none can deny Believers to be as much Gods ſervants, as any mans ſervants are his, and that he hath as abſolute a dominion over them, as men ever can have over thoſe which are theirs, being bought with a price as well as any. Now who knows not that ſervants are ſo their Maſters, that they are not their own, not *ſui juris*, cannot command themſelves, not diſpoſe of themſelves, or their time, or their work; all they have, and all they do is their Maſters. Believers then being thus Gods ſervants have nothing, do nothing but what belongs to their Lord, and ſo can deſerve nothing at his hands by all the ſervice they can do him, ſeeing they owe it all to him; who indeed deſerves any thing for doing what he is bound to do, and deſerves puniſhment if he do not do? And therefore if God rewards his ſervants, he doth it out of his liberality, and becauſe it pleaſeth him to reward them, not that any thing is due to them; and if he never ſhould reward them, never had promiſed them a reward, yet ſtill they being ſervants were bound to do his work. Hence our Saviour in that 17. of *Luk.* bids his Diſciples when they have *done all that is commanded them*, or ſuppoſing they could and ſhould do all, yet even then to acknowledge themſelves to be but *unprofitable ſervants*, not only unprofitable to God, (ſo much the Papiſts will grant) but unprofitable to themſelves, in that being bound by the condition of ſervants to obey their Lord, they could not deſerve ſo much as *thanks*, *ver.* 9, much leſs a reward. And ſo in a word, if God give believers any thing it is grace, if nothing it is not injuſtice. He that would deſerve any thing of his Maſter muſt firſt be made free; Manumiſſion muſt go before Merit.

ἐξαγοράζω Eph. 1. 14.

2. Believers owe all to God becauſe they are his beneficiaries, and have received all from God, 1 Cor. 4. 7. *What haſt thou that thou haſt not received? It is God that worketh in you to will, and to do of his own good pleaſure.* Phil. 2. 13. *Not that we are ſufficient of our ſelves, to think any thing as of our ſelves, but our ſufficiency is of God.* 2 Cor. 2. 5. And indeed Papiſts themſelves dare not in plain terms deny

it, but in words confeſs it. And the more ancient, and ſounder Schoolmen roundly aſſert, all the good we do, as well as enjoy to come from God. *No man*, ſays one, *is before-hand with God in doing any thing for God, but God himſelf in every good work, and motion is the firſt mover and doer.* And, *whatever we are* (ſaith another) *whatever we have, whether good actions, or good habits, or the uſe of them, it is all in us out of the liberality of God freely giving all, and preſerving all.* And yet another, *All our good works and merits are Gods free gifts.* He calls them merits, and yet in that very place diſputes againſt the condignity of merits, with this very Argument we have in hand. And though it be true, that the good actions we do are ours as they are wrought by us, and come from us, yet all that is good in them is of God, and they have no more goodneſs in them than what they have of him. Now then hence it will follow that men can deſerve nothing of God, Rom. 11. 35. *Who hath firſt given to him, and it ſhall be recompenſed to him again?* They that have not firſt given to God ſomething which is their own, ſomething which they never received from him, cannot oblige him to recompenſe them. And indeed it is contrary to common ſenſe, that a man ſhould deſerve any thing of another by giving him back what he received from him, and ſo that God ſhould be a debtor to us for thoſe very good works which himſelf hath wrought in us. Thus ſome of the Papiſts themſelves argue. *If God*, ſays one, *gives a ſoul grace, he gives it freely, and no man will ſay that becauſe he hath given him one gift, he ows him another, therefore when God freely gives a ſoul charity, he is not conſequently bound to give it glory.* Nay the other go farther, and argue that the more good a man doth the more he receives from God, (ſeeing it is of God that he doth that very good) and therefore is ſo far from obliging God by what he doth, that he is himſelf more bound to God. And indeed it is a clear caſe, that the more a man ows to God, the leſs capable he is of deſerving any thing of God, but the more good a man doth the more he ows, becauſe the more he doth the more he receives, and conſequently the beſt Saints, that do moſt, ſeeing they likewiſe receive moſt, muſt needs owe moſt; and therefore merit leaſt. Indeed did they do their good works meerly in their own ſtrength, and without receiving grace from God, ſo that they could call their works purely their own, more might be ſaid in defence of Merits; But when no believer in the World ever doth one jot of good more than what he is enabled by God to do, and which God works by him; it follows that ſtill as his works encreaſe, ſo his receipts encreaſe, and as they grow, his merits (to ſpeak ſo for once) abate, he

Nullus autem homo prius fecit pro Deo, ipſe enim Deus in qualibet motione et factione eſt primus motor et factor. Bradw. de cauſa Dei. p. 343.

Et illud quod ſumus, et quod habemus, ſive ſint actus boni, ſive habitus, ſeu uſus, totum eſt in nobis ex liberalitate divina gratis dante, et conſervante. Durand. in Sent. l. 1. diſt. 17. q. 2.

Omnes operationes noſtræ et merita ſunt dona Dei. Gregor. Arimin. in Sent. l. 1. diſtinct. 17. q. 1. Art. 2.

Totum quod eſt hominis bonum eſt a Deo Aquin. ſum. 1. 2. q. 114. Art. 1.

Si Deus dat animæ charitatem gratis donat, et nullus diceret quod ex eo quod Deus donet aliquod munus alicui, fiat ei alterius muneris debitor, ergo ex eo quod gratis dat animæ charitatem, non debetur conſequenter etiam gloria. Arimin. ubi ſupra. Vid. Bradward. & Durand. ubi ſupra.

he being in every good work a new debtor to God for the grace whereby he did it.

Arg. 5. The good works of believers are imperfect, and therefore they cannot merit by them. How can a man merit any reward of the Lawgiver by doing that which doth not answer the Law, which requires not only good works but perfectly good ones? He doth not deserve his wages that doth not do his whole work, and do it as he should. Or how can a man deserve a reward by those works which deserve punishment? Can he deserve the blessing and the curse at the same time, and by the same works? But imperfect good works, though the imperfection of them be not actually imputed, and what is good in them be accepted, yet as imperfect, and falling short of the demands of the Law, do deserve the Curse; for, Gal. 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continues not in all that is written in the book of the Law to do it.* And the perfection of good works as well as the works themselves is one of those things which are written in the Law, Luk. 10. 27. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. Now that the good works of believers are imperfect, not only altogether, but each of them in particular, how clear is it to any that ever really exercise themselves in them? Where is there the Saint in the world, but hath some sins mingled with his good works? Who ever holds on in so constant a course of obedience and holiness, but that the good he doth is interrupted with the mixture of some evil? *There is not a just man upon the earth that doth good, and sins not*, says *Solomon* Eccles. 7. 20. *And if we say we have no sin we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us*, saith St. *John*, 1 Joh. 1. 8. And *David* who was as holy as any Papist upon earth, speaks for himself, and all the world besides, that if God should *mark iniquity*, none could *stand*, Psal. 130. 3. And though our Adversaries tell us here *Exc.* that the intermixture of some venial sins, with the good works of the Saints, doth not hinder their perfection, nor meritoriousness, and that their sins are no other: that believers may as they walk toward heaven, have a little dust fall upon them, but do not wallow in the mire; that they do but turn aside in Gods ways, not turn their backs upon them, but halt in them, not forsake them, but squint a little on the World, not turn their faces wholly toward it. Yet this will not suffice till they *Answ.* can solidly establish the distinction of mortal sins, and venial upon Scripture foundations, which they never can till they have made an *Index expurgatorius* upon the Bible it self, and sentenced the holy Penmen of it as *Authores damnatos*, *condemned* them for making those sins *mortal* which they themselves would so fain have only *venial*. No nor after they have done that, till they can produce some one Saint who hath lived all his days without ever falling into any one of their mortal sins. Let them ransack their whole Colledge of Cardinals, search all their Religious houses, examine *Peters* Chair it self, and they shall not find one that dares (and Protestants will not) pretend to be wholly without,

out, or free from some or other of those sins, which they themselves count Mortal.

And if we look to the good works of the Saints in particular, we shall find some defectiveness in every one of them, the best proceed but from an imperfect principle; the new nature, which, in believers during their present state, is but in its growth, not come to its full maturity; it shall be made perfect, and therefore is not yet perfect. God promises that believers shall grow in grace, Psal. 92. 12, 13, 14. *The righteous shall flourish as the Palm tree, and grow like a Cedar in Lebanon.* They are commanded to grow, 2 Pet. 3. 18. *Grow in grace.* It is their endeavour to grow, Phil. 3. 12, 13, 14. *They reach out to things before them, and press forward*, &c. And it is their priviledge that they do grow, 2 Cor. 4. 16. *Their inner man is renewed day by day.* And there is no time of a Saints life in which it is not his duty to grow in grace; the command obligeth them all as long as they are on this side heaven. But if grace were come to its full perfection, there would be no more need of growing in it, no more obligation so to do. Besides, there is no Saint, but as he hath some grace in him, so he hath some remainders of corruption too, *sin dwelling in him*, as well as *Paul* had, Rom. 7. 17, the *Law* of the *members* as well as the Law of the *mind*, ver. 23. *flesh* as well as *spirit*, Gal. 5. 17. As one principle which draws him off from sin, so another, which inclines him to it; as one which puts him upon good, so another which makes him in some degree averse to it, as something which makes him do the work, and in some measure as he should; so something which checks and cools him, and makes him not do it altogether as he should. Now from hence ariseth a double imperfection in the best works of the Saints: One is a want or failing of that intenseness, or those degrees of goodness, that height and excellency of it which the Law of God requires; for where the principle it self is not fully perfect, the actings of that principle cannot but be imperfect; the effect can be no better than the cause: The other is the adherence of some evil to the work, some spot or stain cleaving to it: as sin dwells in the same soul, the same mind, the same will and affections with grace, so it mingles it self with the actings of grace; there being something of mud in the fountain, it dirties the stream; the vessel having a tang, derives it to the liquor that runs out of it; there being something of venom in the flower, it insinuates it self into, and mingles with that sweet vapour that comes from it: so that upon the whole every act of a Saint is some way or other defective, and blemished, and comes short of a legal accurateness, and therefore is not able to abide a legal trial: that any are at all accepted with God, it is upon the sole account of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 2. 5. Him we find, *Rev.* 8. 3. offering incense with the prayers of the Saints, and his Type the High Priest, Exod. 28. 38. *Bearing the iniquities of the holy things which the children of Israel hallowed in all their holy gifts.* And sure then if the good works of believers

lievers are accepted for Christs sake, they are not rewarded for their own; their goodness cannot deserve a recompence, when their infirmities need a covering: their weakness argues their not answering the Law, and if they do not answer it, they cannot deserve to be rewarded according to it.

Arg. 6. Believers need forgiveness of sin, and therefore cannot by all their good deeds merit life. That they need forgiveness is plain not only by the former Argument, (in that there is no man so full of good works, but he hath some sins mingled with them; and there are no good works in this life, so full of goodness, but they have some mixture of evil too.) and by our Saviours command to pray for pardon, and that daily, Mat. 6. 12. *Forgive us our debts.* But likewise by the practice of the Saints in Scripture, *Psal.* 25. 11. *Dan.* 9. 19. 1 King. 8. 34, 36. and the practice of the Papists themselves; How many *Pater Nosters*, and *Kyrie Eleesons*, do they daily say? The veriest Saints among them confess their sins, and pray for pardon. The Pope himself, for all his *Holiness*, and his *pardoning* other mens sins, yet *confesseth his own.* Now if Saints themselves need forgiveness, how do they deserve Heaven? How can the Conscience of sin, and the merit of life consist together? He that prays for pardon confesseth himself a sinner, and he that owns himself a sinner, acknowledgeth himself to be worthy of death; and if he be worthy of death, how is he worthy of life? If he deserve a punishment, sure he doth not at the same time deserve a reward? If they shall say, that they pray only for the pardon of venial sins, it signifies little; they had as good keep their breath for something else, seeing after all their seeking the forgiveness of them, yet they must be fain to expiate them hereafter in Purgatory: And if they do by their venial sins deserve Purgatory, how do they at the same time merit Heaven? And therefore either let the Papists cease to pray for pardon, or to pretend to merit. To beg forgiveness, if they do not indeed sin, is to mock God, and to pretend to merit if they do, is to mock themselves.

Arg. 7. The good works of believers are not commensurate and equal in goodness, and value to eternal life, and therefore cannot deserve it. Common sense will evince the truth of the consequence. Who can say that such a work deserves such a reward, if it be not equal in worth, and value to it, any more than that such a Commodity deserves such a price, if it be not of equal worth with it? And Papists themselves grant as much; *Aquinas* makes the just reward of a mans labour, and the price of a thing bought to be both alike of Justice, and requires an equality wherever strict justice is. And that the good works of the Saints are not equal to eternal life, unless they be grown better than they were in *Pauls* time, is clear by Rom. 8. 18. *For I reckon, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us*: And if the sufferings of the Saints are not worthy of their glory,

Vid. 1. 2. q. 114. Art. 1.

glory, ſure none of their other works are; their ſufferings, (wherein they are not meerly paſſive, but active too, for *they chuſe to ſuffer afflictions*, Heb. 11. 25.) being ſome of the moſt excellent of their works, and in which moſt grace is exerciſed. The Papiſts common Anſwer is, That the good works of Believers as they come meerly from them, and their free will are not worthy of, or equal to their glory, but yet that they are ſo as they proceed from grace, a ſupernatural principle in their hearts. But we have ſeen before, that that very principle though excellent, noble, divine as to the nature of it; yet in reſpect of its degrees, is but imperfect, and therefore the actings which proceed from it muſt needs be ſo too, there being ſuch a mixture of ſin in the heart where grace is ſeated, it mingles it ſelf with the actings of grace in our works. And how then can we ſay that an imperfect work deſerves a full reward? That the poor lame performances of believers are equal to that abundant glory, which God in his goodneſs hath prepared for them?

Exc.

Anſw.

Arg. 8. Believers cannot recompenſe to God what they have already received of him, and therefore cannot by all they do merit any thing of him. They that are debtors to God can by no means make him a debtor to them; when they owe him ſo much, he can owe them nothing. Debt to God muſt be diſcharged before any obligation can be laid upon him. And that Saints cannot recompenſe God for what they have received of him, is clear by what was ſaid before, for they have received of him all they are, all they have, all they do, their being, their powers and faculties, their good inclinations, principles, actings. And what can a man return to God which may recompenſe him for all theſe? It is a known ſaying of the Philoſopher, That no man can requite God, or his Parents. And indeed if a Son cannot return equal to his Father for the being he hath received from him, though but ſubordinately to God, much leſs can he recompenſe God himſelf for that, and all elſe which he hath received from him. But deſerving a reward at Gods hands, eſpecially ſuch a one as we ſpeak of, is much more than meerly to requite him for what he hath done for us, and therefore ſuch a reward, by all our good works we can never poſſibly merit. I conclude this with that of *Bradwardine*, *God hath given to and for man, miſerable captive man, man obnoxious to eternal flames, himſelf made man, ſuffering, dying, buried, that he might redeem him, and he promiſeth, and giveth himſelf wholly to be enjoyed by man as his great reward, which infinitely exceeds any meer man:* And conſequently all his power, all his holineſs, all his good works. What Saint on earth can requite God for giving himſelf for him, and how then can he merit the enjoyment of God? If the firſt be above his requital, I am ſure the other is above his deſert.

Ariſt. Eth. l. 8.

Deus dedit homini, & pro miſero homine, & captivo, Flammis perpetuis obligato, ſeipſum incarnatum, paſſum, & ſepultum, in precium temporaliter redimendo; promittit inſuper & dat ſeipſum totum in præmium fœliciter conſumendo, quod excedit quemlibet parum hominem infinite. Bradw. p. 345.

Certe domine qui me feciſti, debeo amori tuo meipſum totum, qui me redemiſti, debeo meipſum totum: imo tantum debeo amori tuo plus quam meipſum, quantum tu es major me, pro quo dediſti teipſum, & cui promittis teipſum. Anſelm. apud Bradw. ibid.

Arg. 9.

Arg. 9. He that deſerves any thing of another muſt do ſomething whereby that other hath ſome benefit or advantage, for no man can be ſaid to merit at anothers hand, by doing that which is advantageous only to himſelf. But Believers, by all they do, profit themſelves, if any, not God; they bring no gain, make no addition to him, it is their own good, their own happineſs they farther and advance by all their holineſs and good works, but not God's, who is ſtill, after all the good Works of all the Saints on earth for theſe 5000 years and upwards, the ſame he was before: All their mites have added nothing to his Treaſures, all their drops nothing to his Ocean. *Job* 22. 2. *Can a man be profitable to God as a man that is wiſe may be profitable to himſelf?* ver. 3. *Is it gain to him that thou makeſt thy ways perfect?* And therefore it muſt needs follow, that Believers by their good works deſerve nothing of God.

Arg. 10. The Popiſh Doctrine of Merits highly derogates from the honour of God and Chriſt, and therefore is not to be admitted.

1. It derogates from the glory of God;

1. In his Liberality, for God is the moſt liberal giver, *Jam.* 1. 5. Every good, we ſay, by how much the greater it is, ſo much the more communicative it is, and God being the greateſt good, muſt needs be moſt communicative, moſt liberal, and that too to ſuch an height, as nothing can be conceived more ſo. Now he that gives freely, is more liberal, more generous, more communicative, than he that gives out of debt, or on the account of deſert, and therefore that moſt free and liberal way of giving muſt be aſcribed unto God, as moſt ſutable to him, and we cannot ſay that God gives any thing to his Creatures out of debt, but we diminiſh the glory of his liberality.

2. In his Liberty. It is a ſubjecting him to his Creature. He that owes any thing to another is ſo far forth ſubject to him; *the borrower is ſervant to the lender.* Prov. 22. 7. He that gives all freely, is more free himſelf, than he that gives only becauſe he owes it. And therefore if God be a debtor to man, and bound in Juſtice to reward him, he doth not act ſo freely as if no ſuch obligation lay upon him.

2. It derogates likewiſe from the glory of Chriſt, becauſe from his Merits. Whoever merits any thing, acquires thereby a right to that thing which before he had not, either in whole or in part. A day-labourer hath no right to his wages, but by his work, and till his work be done cannot challenge it; and ſo if Believers merit eternal life, they do by their works get a title to it, which before their working they had not: and if they do by their works acquire a right wholly to eternal life, then Chriſt hath not at all merited it for them; if in part they merit it, then Chriſt hath but in part merited it for them; and ſomething there is in eternal life which Chriſt hath not merited. And it is in vain to ſay that Chriſt hath merited for the Saints a power of meriting, and that it is more for his glory to enable them to do it, than to do it wholly himſelf. For, beſides that, the Papiſts can never prove that Chriſt hath

vid. Cham. tom. tert. l. 14. c. 20.

Exc.

Anſw.

merited any such power for Believers, it is really more for the honour of his bounty to purchase all for them himself, than to enable them to it. As he is more bountiful who gives a man a great estate out of his own proper goods, than he that enables him to get an estate by his labour and industry.

Indeed *Bellarmine* speaks plainly, that God would have his children merit Heaven, because it is more for their honour than to have it given them. *De Justif. l. 5. c. 3.* So little is his eminency concern'd for God's glory, as zealous as he is for the credit of the Saints: methinks he might have remembred, that what is given to the one is taken away from the other; and if it be more for the Saints honour to have their inheritance by way of merit, yet it is more for God's glory that they have it as a gift.

Other arguments might be added, but I had rather mention enough than all. I have been larger in these, because, though some of the more learned among the Papists place the meritoriousness of good works upon something else than the intrinsick excellency of them, yet this is the most popular and dangerous error among them; the vulgar sort not understanding the distinctions and niceties of some few Scholars, are more apt to believe their good works to be of their own nature, and for their own excellency meritorious. More briefly therefore of the rest: *Bellarmine* bears us in hand, that the compleat meritoriousness of good works ariseth from the addition of God's promise to them; so that they which would not have merited eternal life otherwise, (though proportioned to it, if he may be believed) yet the promise being made, are truly worthy of it.

Against this we argue; that if the accession of the promise make good works to be truly meritorious, then it must be either because the promise makes good works better, more excellent and noble than they would have been, had no such promise been made; or else because (which is this Cardinals notion) the promise obligeth God in justice to reward them, which without it he were not bound to do.

1. But the addition of God's promise doth not raise the rate of good works, not ennoble them, nor add any intrinsecal dignity or worth to them, nor make them in themselves better than they would have been if such a promise had not been made, the promise being something extrinsecal to the works themselves, *&c.* From whence therefore they can receive no new degrees of inward goodness or worth. The proper formal excellency of a good action ariseth from its conformity to its rule, the rightness of the principle from whence it proceeds, and to which it is directed: if therefore it proceed from a supernatural principle, and be referred to a supernatural end, and be in other things agreeable to its proper rule, which is the command of God, and not the promise; (for that though it be an encouragement to work, yet is not the rule of our working) it hath all in it that is necessary to the essence of a good work, whether

whether any promiſe be made to it or not. Indeed, the more high and intenſe the principle of Grace is from whence it proceeds, and the more directly and expreſly it is ordered to its end, and the more exactly it is conformable to its rule, the more good, the more gracious it is; but the adding of the promiſe makes it not one jot more gracious, more intrinſecally worthy: had God never made any promiſe of rewarding the good works of Believers, yet they would have been as good as now they are. Nay, I meet with a School-man that ſays, if the promiſe make any alteration in the nature of a good work, it is rather by diminiſhing from its goodneſs than adding to it; ſo far as it may be an occaſion of a mans acting leſs out of love to God, and more out of love to himſelf. However did any new goodneſs accrew to a good work by the acceſſion of God's promiſe, it would follow, that the leaſt good work of a Saint ſhould thereby be ſo elevated and raiſed in its worth and value, as to be made equal to the greateſt; the giving a cup of cold water to one of Chriſt's Diſciples, ſhould be equal to a mans laying down his life for Chriſt; for they which agree in ſome third, agree between themſelves; (as the learned Biſhop *Davenant* argues) and ſo if the giving a cup of cold water to a Diſciple of Chriſt, be by God's promiſe made equal to eternal life, dying for Chriſt being no more, even after the acceſſion of the promiſe, they muſt be both equally good, and (in the Papiſts ſtile) equally meritorious actions, becauſe both commenſurate to, and meritorious of the ſame reward. Nay, ſuppoſing God ſhould promiſe eternal life to a meerly moral work, which had no ſupernatural goodneſs in it, or to an action in it ſelf indifferent, yet that action, though not gracious in it ſelf, ſhould be of as great dignity and value as any the beſt and moſt ſpiritual action what-ever; for the beſt action cannot be imagined by Papiſts themſelves to deſerve any more than eternal life, and even a meer moral or indifferent one would by the help of the promiſe deſerve as much, and yet the Papiſts acknowledg that none but gracious ones can deſerve it. And how abſurd would it ſeem in the things of this life, for a promiſe or contract thus to raiſe the value of a mans labour or mony, above the due eſtimation, and intrinſick worth of it? Would it not ſeem ſtrange, nay ridiculous to affirm, when two men buy two parcels of a commodity, of equal worth in themſelves, but at unequal rates; ſuppoſe the one at 100 *l.* as the full value, the other at 5 *l.* that the contract made between the buyer and ſeller, or the promiſe of the ſeller to let his Chapman have his goods at ſuch a price, did raiſe the value of his five pounds, and make it equal to the others hundred? who would grant this? who would not ſay that ſuch a commodity were in a manner given away, or the juſt price of it abated, rather than the value of the mony raiſed? It is a caſe here, and what our Adverſaries ſpeak of good works being made meritorious by the addition of God's promiſe, is no leſs ridiculous and void of reaſon.

Nec illa promiſſio facit opus melius, ut patet per ſubſtantiam operis, & per omnes ejus circumſtantias inductive; imo forſitan minus bonum; facit enim intentionem minus ſinceram; quia enim prius operabatur pure propter Deum ſolum, nunc forſitan operetur propter retributionem promiſſam. Bradw. de Cauſa Dei, l. 1. p. 339.

Quæ conveniunt in aliquo tertio conveniunt inter ſe. De juſt. actu. c. 63.

2. The addition of God's promiſe of rewarding good works, doth not bind him in ſtrict juſtice to reward them. We acknowledg that he is engaged, by his immutability and faithfulneſs, to reward the holineſs of his Saints, having once promiſed ſo to do; but that is no more than to ſay, that God is engaged to act like himſelf, ſuitably to his own nature; it is agreeable to God, as God, to be faithful and true to his word; if he were not faithful, he could not be God, not to be *faithful* were to *deny himſelf*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 13. But it is quite another thing to be bound in ſtrict juſtice to render to men ſuch a reward as he hath promiſed. For the object of juſtice being the equality of the thing given, and the thing received, and it being the buſineſs of juſtice to ſee to that equality, and that ſo much be returned for ſo much, God being bound by his promiſe to make ſuch an equality of the reward to the work, argues imperfection in him; for it implies that God is mans debtor, and hath received more of him than hitherto he hath given him, or that a mans works exceed all his receits, and all God's former bounty: in a word, that man hath done more for God, than God hath yet done for him, on the account whereof he is bound to give him more, (*viz.* the reward) that ſo there may be an equality. And if this do not imply imperfection in God, what doth? Beſides, if after God hath promiſed glory to a righteous man walking in his righteouſneſs, yet he ſhould not give it him, ſuch an one could only ſay that God did break his word, or act contrary to his faithfulneſs, but he could not ſay he acted unjuſtly, or did not give him as much as he received from him. *If* (ſaith a Papiſt himſelf) *God ſhould not give glory to a man that died in a ſtate of Grace, or ſhould take it away from one already poſſeſſed of it, yet in ſo doing he ſhould not be unrighteous.* To conclude, juſtice properly taken implies an equality, and where equality is not, there cannot be juſtice; but there is no equality not only between God and man, but between mans working, and Gods rewarding; and it is not the addition of a promiſe that either levels the reward to the work, or raiſeth the work to the reward.

Si Deus decedenti in gratia non daret gloriam, aut ſi habenti gloriam auferret, tamen nihil injuſtum faceret. Durand. ubi ſupr. Aquin. 1, 2. p. 114. Art. 1.

But, ſay ſome of our Adverſaries, good works become meritorious of eternal life, by being ſprinkled with Chriſt's blood, commended to God by his merits. We would willingly ſee the proof of it; let them tell us, if they can, what it is which Chriſt's merits do ſuper-add to the goodneſs of the work whereby it becomes meritorious, when before, though truly good, it was not ſo. We grant indeed, that as there is no goodneſs in our ſelves, ſo likewiſe none in our works, which is not the effect of Chriſt's merits; but ſuppoſing the goodneſs of them, we would know what it is that Chriſt's merits do further add to them to make them meritorious. True indeed, the merits of Chriſt do procure both acceptance and reward for the good works of the Saints, but they do not make theſe works intrinſecally perfect: they are the cauſe why the failings of the Saints in them are not imputed, but they do not remove

move those failings and weaknesses from them. Nay more, Christ's merits do no more make the good works of believers meritorious, than Christ communicates to believers themselves a power of meriting, but that can never be; a meer creature is uncapable of such a power: to merit is proper to Christ only, and cannot agree to any of his members; the power of meriting eternal life consists in the infinite virtue of the person meriting answering to the glory merited; and therefore to say that Christ, by his merits, makes the good works of the Saints meritorious, is to say that he communicates to themselves an infinite power, and to their works an infinite excellency. *Vid. Rivett. Orthod. Cathol.*

To all these I add but this one general Argument. It is not lawful for men to trust in their own works, and therefore they do not merit any thing of God by them; for what reason can be given why a man might not put confidence in them, if they really deserved a reward of God, and so were really the cause of mans salvation? It is true indeed, the confidence of a believer, and his rejoycing in the goodness and safety of his spiritual estate, and hope of life, may be helped on by, and in a sense proceed from his obedience and good works, because they are an evidence of his faith, and so of his interest in Christ, acceptance with God, and title to the heavenly inheritance; but this is quite another thing; there is a vast difference between a mans taking comfort in his obedience, as the evidence of his title to glory; and trusting in it, as that which gives him that title. *Nehemiah*, though he reflect on his good deeds, and comfort himself in them, yet expects his reward on another account, *Chap.* 13. *ver.* 22. *Spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy*; and so our Psalmist in the Text, *To thee belongeth mercy, for thou rendrest to every man according to his works*: and how frequently do we find the Saints disclaiming all confidence in their own holiness and obedience, when they have to do with God and his judgment? But to descend from the Saints to a Cardinal, *Bellarmine* himself after his laborious disputes in defence of merits, and for justification by works, in the very same Chapter where he pleads for the lawfulness of mens trusting in them, at last hath this conclusion, *That, because of the uncertainty of mans own righteousness, and the danger of vain-glory, it is the safest way for men to place their whole confidence in the mercy and goodness of God alone.* And if *Bellarmine* say it is safest, I will say it is wisest, and the Cardinal doth but trifle in contending so much for the merit of good works, and so in a business of the highest importance, putting men upon a course which he himself dares not say is safe. *Propter incertitudinem propriæ justitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ, tutissimum est totam fiduciam in sola Dei misericordia, & benignitate reponere.* De Justif. l. 5. c. 7. prop. 3.

Having said thus much for the confirmation of the truth against the Papists, it is high time we give them leave to speak for themselves, and hear what they can say for the merit of good works in relation to the reward of eternal glory.

First therefore they tell us, that eternal life is in Scripture frequently called a *reward*, *Matt.* 5. 12. *Great is your reward in Heaven*; 2 Joh. 8. *Obj.* 1.

But

But that we receive a full reward; Rev. 22. 12. *I come quickly, and my reward is with me*: and so in other places. Now, say they, *Merces & meritum*, a reward and merit are correlates; so that merit infers reward, and reward implies merit; and therefore if Heaven, which is given to believers, be the reward of their works, their works must needs be the merit of that reward.

Answ. 1. A reward may be taken either strictly, and properly, for that which is given to a man not only on consideration of his work, but is proportioned, and measured out according to it, and is in strict justice due to him for it. And in this sense we deny that eternal life is ever in the Scripture called a reward; and let our Adversaries prove it if they can: Or, secondly, it is taken improperly and metaphorically, and then there is no such relation between it and merit, as the objection mentions. שכר Thus, *Gen.* 30. 18. *God hath given me my hire, or reward*, saith *Leah*, and yet who can say that she merited a son at God's hands, by giving her hand-maid to her husband? *Psal.* 127. 3. *The fruit of the womb is his reward*; and I wonder then what is the merit? Indeed, what is reward in the latter part of the verse, but the same that heritage in the former? So, *Gen.* 15. 1. *I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.* And will the Papists say that God himself falls under mens merit? and yet so it must be, if there be such a necessary relation between reward and merit. Yet more fully, *Rom.* 4. 4. *To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.* Here are plainly two sorts of rewards, one proper, and of debt; the other improper, and of grace. And therefore I conclude, that eternal life is called a reward in Scripture improperly, and metaphorically, and no otherwise than as any thing given to another on consideration of service done, may be called a reward, though it be a thousand times greater than the service is, or though it be not at all due to him to whom it is given; as when a Master gives something to his slave who hath done his work well, though he were not bound to it, his servant being his mony, and being bound to do do his work, and do it well, though no reward should be given him.

Exc. Answ. 2. As eternal life is sometimes called a reward, so it is other times called a gift, *Rom. 6.* 23. If it be here excepted, that it is properly called a reward, and metaphorically a gift: *Camero* answers, that that which is properly a gift, may metaphorically be called a reward, as if it be given on the account of some service, as when a Master gives a gift to his servant for doing his work, which yet (as before) he was not obliged to give; but that which is properly a reward, can by no means be called a gift, because a real proper reward implies something worthy of it, whereby it is deserved, and the reward is a debt due in justice to such a work; and so if eternal life be a reward, it cannot at all be called a gift, at least without an unpardonable *catachresis*; whereas, though it be properly a gift, it may figuratively be called a reward, because of some resemblance to it, in that God rewards men with eternal glory after they

Oper. p. 44. c. 1.

have

have done him ſervice, though they were bound to have ſerved him, however no ſuch reward were to be given them. And yet again, eternal life is called an inheritance, as well as a reward; and, ſays a learned man, either both theſe names are given it properly, or both figuratively; or one properly, and the other figuratively; the firſt cannot be, for to be properly an inheritance and reward too, will imply a contradiction: who knows not that a reward properly taken is always deſerved, but an inheritance is not; and ſo eternal life, if it be properly both, muſt be given to ſome antecedent deſert, becauſe a reward; and without it, becauſe an inheritance; and ſo freely, and not freely; out of juſtice, and not out of juſtice. If it be metaphorically only called both a reward and an inheritance, we gain as much as we need, for then it is not properly a reward, and ſo not truly deſerved, the Papiſts themſelves being judges. If one be taken properly, the other figuratively, it may eaſily be proved that the figurative ſenſe muſt rather be applyed to its being a reward than an inheritance, unleſs we will ſay not only that eternal life is properly a reward, but believers are properly mercenaries; and if the Papiſts are ſo fond of their merits, that rather than fail they will own themſelves mercenaries, much good may it do them, we envy them not the honour.

Chamier. de bon. oper. c. 6.

Obj. 2.

Several places they alledge where the Scripture ſpeaks of believers as worthy of the reward: 2 *Theſ.* 1. 5. *That ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God:* Rev. 3. 4. *They ſhall walk with me in white, for they are worthy.* Much ſtreſs they lay upon the word *worthy*, and ſo argue the Saints to merit eternal life, becauſe they are ſaid to be worthy of it.

εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ σεσεισπασμένον μὴ ἐμὲ ἀναπαύεσθαι, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν.

The *worthineſs* ſpoken of in ſuch places, is plainly the Saints fitneſs for, and ſutableneſs to, the reward of glory; that diſpoſition which God works in thoſe whom he intends to glorifie: of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Col.* 1. 12. *Who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light:* where the vulgar Latin renders it, *Qui dignos, nos fecit*, though the Greek ἱκανώσαντι ſignifie no more than, as we tranſlate it, making *meet*, or *fit*. And in how many other places is the ſame word uſed for fitneſs, or ſutableneſs? *Matth.* 3. 8. *Bring forth fruits meet for repentance*, that is, ſuch as become thoſe who truly repent, and yet the Greek hath it, worthy of repentance: and if we take it in the Popiſh ſenſe, what fruits are they which are worthy of repentance, ſo as to merit it? not works before it, for they themſelves will not affirm works wrought before the firſt grace, to merit that grace, at leaſt by way of condignity. Nor can it be ſaid of works after repentance; for who is ſo weak as to ſay, a man may truly and properly deſerve what he hath already, by ſomething which he doth afterwards? Other places confirm our interpretation of the word, *Eph.* 4. 1. *That ye walk worthy of the vocation where-with ye are called*; ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι is no more than to walk ſutably or agreeably to their calling. And *Phil.* 1. 27.

καρπὸς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας.

ἀξίως

Ἀξίως τῆ εὐαγγελίε πολιτεύεσθαι, to have our converſation *worthy* of the Goſpel, is no more, than as our tranſlation renders it, as *becomes the Goſpel*. And ἀξιοῦσθαι, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 5. which we render to *count worthy*, is no more than *dignari*, to vouchſafe: and the ſame uſe both of the Greek and Latin word is frequent in Heathen Authors, ſo that nothing for merit in a proper ſenſe can be inferred from it. Or, if dignity muſt needs be in the caſe, the Greek word will rather ſignify, to dignify, or put honour upon another, than ſuppoſe any dignity inherent in him, or, if you pleaſe ſo to deal with a man, as if he were worthy, whether he be ſo or not; and thus it will rather imply a kind of imputation of worthineſs to a perſon, than its being really in him.

Conjugio Ænea Venetis dignitate ſuperbo. Virg. *Quos quoniam cæli nondum dignamur honore.* Ovid. Ἀξιώματος, *qui imprimis honore dignus habetur, vel plurimi fit.* Ἀξιοῦσθαι *dignum judicare.* Suid.

Again, when the Saints are ſaid to be worthy, it is not to be underſtood of any ſuch dignity in them, as anſwers to what the Law requires, or of an abſolute worthineſs of the reward, but rather of a comparative one; when they are ſaid to be worthy, they are compared with wicked men, in reſpect of whom they may be ſaid ſo to be; becauſe, although, in ſtrict juſtice, they do not merit life, yet they are qualified for it, and ſuited to it, by having thoſe holy diſpoſitions wrought in them, which God intended to furniſh them with, in order to the enjoyment of ſo glorious a recompence as he hath deſigned them for.

Obj. 3. Bellarm. *de Juſtific. l.* 5. *c.* 3.

Thoſe places of Scripture are objected, in which the reward is ſaid to be given men according to the proportion and meaſure of their works and labour: from whence they infer, that in rewarding good works, God hath reſpect not meerly to his liberality, or promiſe, or favour, but to the dignity and efficacy of the works themſelves; ſo that as evil works do really deſerve eternal death, good ones do likewiſe deſerve eternal life.

Anſw. The general anſwer to this Argument was laid down in the explication of the Text, *viz.* That God's rewarding men according to their works, is to be underſtood of the nature and kind of them, not of the value and dignity of them, that they who do well, ſhall fare well; and they that do otherwiſe, ſhall be otherwiſe dealt with: it ſhall be well with the righteous, and ill with the wicked; there is a bleſſing for the one, and a curſe for the other. As for the particular Scriptures, they may be eaſily anſwered: firſt, my text is brought in againſt me, that God *renders to every man according to his work*, but it carries its anſwer along with it, that though God reward men according to their works, and ſo give life to thoſe that are righteous, yet it is out of meer mercy he doth it: let but *Bellarmine* read the whole verſe together, and make the beſt of it he can. And for *Luke* 6. 38. *With the ſame meaſure you mete, it ſhall be meaſured to you again*; either it is to be underſtood not of God's judging and rewarding men in the future life, but of mans judgment in this life; as if he had ſaid, as you deal with others, ſo others ſhall deal with you, you ſhall have ſuch as you bring, and be paid in your own coyn: Or elſe, if it be meant of God's judgment, yet it is of a judgment

of

of condemnation, not of abſolution, and ſo is wholly impertinent to the buſineſs in hand; Chriſt doth not ſay, do not abſolve others, leſt God ſhould abſolve you; but, do not condemn others, *i. e.* raſhly, ſinfully, leſt God condemn you righteouſly; and ſo much ſeems to be implyed in the parallel place, *Matth.* 7. 1, 2. 1 *Cor.* 3. 8. is alledged too, *Every man ſhall receive his own reward according to his own labour*, but to little purpoſe; for the Apoſtle ſpeaks not there of the ſalvation of ſome, and the damnation of others, but only of the difficulty of the ſalvation of ſome, who had built on the foundation, *wood, hay, ſtubble*, *ver.* 12, 13, 14, 15. who, he ſays, ſhould be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire: ſome ſhould be ſaved with more difficulty than others, yet all ſhould be ſaved. The othe other places they bring here (*Matth.* 16. 27. *Reward every man according to his works*, Gal. 6. 7. *What-ever a man ſoweth, that alſo ſhall he reap*, Rom. 2. 6. *Who will render to every man according to his deeds*,) need no more than the general anſwer before given, which is confirmed by *ver.* 7, 8, 9, 10. of the ſame Chapter, which ſpeak plainly of the kind or quality, according to which the reward ſhall be given, not of the worth or dignity of them; and yet it is further aſſured by the laſt place the Papiſts alledge under this head, *Rev.* 22. 12. *To give to every man as his work ſhall be.* This text is a Commentary on all the reſt, for what is in the other places, κατὰ τὰ ἔργα, according to their works, is in this place, ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ ἔσται, *as his work ſhall be*; that is, if a good work, eternal life; if an evil one, eternal death.

Thoſe places are urged, in which eternal life is ſo ſaid to be given to good works, as that thoſe works are the reaſon why it is given them. The chief are, *Matth.* 25. 34, 35. *Inherit the Kingdom prepared for you*, &c. *for I was an hungred*, &c. *Rev.* 7. 14, 15. *Theſe are they which come out of great tribulation*, &c. *therefore are they before the Throne of God.* *Obj.* 4.

The ſtreſs of this Argument lies on thoſe particles, *for, therefore*, &c. too ſlender twigs to keep the Popiſh cauſe from ſinking. For they do not alwaies ſignify a connexion by way of cauſality, or one thing being the true and proper cauſe of another, but only by way of conſequence, or the following of one thing upon another; the connexion of two things, whereof the one is Antecedent, the other Conſequent: as if you ſay it is day, *for* the Sun is up; you then aſſert the Suns being up to be the reaſon of its being day, and rightly too; but if you ſay, it is day, *for* I ſee the Sun; you will not affirm your ſeeing the Sun to be the reaſon of its being day, and your *for* will ſignifie no more than that your ſeeing the Sun, follows upon its being day; you prove well that it is day, becauſe you ſee the Sun; but you prove it not by the cauſe, but by the effect. If you ſhould ſay Popery is a wicked Religion, *for* it makes Treaſon lawful, you ſhew why it is a wicked Religion; but if you ſay ſome Papiſts have been wicked wretches, *for* they have been convicted of Treaſon, and hang'd for their pains; you do not al- *Anſw.*

ledge their being convicted, and hang'd, as the cauſe of their wickedneſs. So likewiſe in the places urged upon us, when the reward is ſaid to be given to men *for* or *becauſe* they have done thus and thus, that doth not imply their having done ſo and ſo to be the proper cauſe of the reward given them, but only the connexion between their work and their reward, their ſo doing, and ſo receiving; 1 *Tim.* 1. 13. *Paul* ſpeaking of his blaſpheming, and perſecuting, ſays he obtained mercy, *becauſe* he did it ignorantly in unbelief. And can any man ſay, that *Paul*'s ignorance and unbelief (allow that they might leſſen the ſinfulneſs of his perſecution and blaſphemy,) were the meritorious cauſes of his obtaining mercy? *Matth* 16.2. *When it is evening ye ſay it will be fair weather, for the ſkie is red.* Is the redneſs of the ſky the cauſe of fair weather, or only an indication of it? when therefore Chriſt invites the Saints to inherit the Kingdom prepared for them, &c. becauſe he was an hungred, and they gave him meat, &c. he doth not thereby ſignifie that their good works were the meritorious cauſes of their inheriting that Kingdom, but only the *Antecedents of it*, and the *Evidences of their title to it.* And that is confirmed by our Saviour's own words, in that he doth not meerly call them to take poſſeſſion of it, but to *inherit* it, or take poſſeſſion of it as heirs, and by right of inheritance, and conſequently not in the right of their merits. And if he had meant thoſe works he mentions to have been the meritorious cauſe of their ſalvation, he could (with *Bellarmine*'s good leave) have more clearly expreſſed it, and plainly told them, that they had merited the Kingdom, and he was bound in juſtice to ſee them ſetled in the poſſeſſion of it, ſo that it can no more be concluded from hence, that the Saints do, by their good works, deſerve Heaven as their reward, than, if God ſhould have ſaid to the Iſraelites at the end of their forty years voyage toward *Canaan*, Go in now, and poſſeſs the promiſed Land, *for* you have been forty years in the wilderneſs, and have been expoſed to many difficulties and hazards, that therefore they had thereby merited that Land.

Whitak. *contra Duræum. Quia fides factis declaratur, quæ omnibus nota ſunt, & manifeſta, conſentaneum eſt ex factis potius quam fide ſententiam pronunciari.* κληρονομήσατε.

Antequam Chriſtus hæc ſanctorum opera commemorat veras & proprias ſalutis cauſas attingit, &c. quando enim hæreditatem eos adire jubet, Dei in Chriſto Adoptioni omnem juſtitiæ & ſalutis cauſam habuit. Quod enim jure hæreditario aliquis poſſidet, id ſuis operibus minime meretur. Tum quod ſubjungit peratum hoc illis fuiſſe regnum a jactis mundi fundamentis æternum Dei electionem omnibus operum meritis oppovit. Qd.

Exc. If it be ſaid that Chriſt ſpeaks the ſame, & as much of the good works of the Saints as he doth of the evil works of the wicked, the ſame word *for* being uſed, *ver.* 42, as well as *ver.* 35.

Anſw. I anſwer, that it will not follow from thence, that good works are as truly and properly the cauſes of ſalvation, as evil ones are of damnation, there being ſo great a difference in the caſe; and we do not conclude mens wicked works to be the cauſe of their damnation meerly becauſe of the Conjunction uſed by our Saviour in this place, but from the nature of the thing it ſelf, and other Scriptures, which ſpeak more fully to it.

As for that place, *Rev.* 7. take but the whole words together, and *Bellarmine* hath his answer, *ver.* 14. *These are they that come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb*, then follows *ver.* 15. *Therefore are they before the Throne of God.* Wherefore? because not only they come out of great tribulation, but because they have washed their garments, *&c.*

These places of Scripture are urged where eternal life is promised to good works, *Matth.* 19. 17. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments*, ver. 29. *Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters*, &c. *for my name sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life*; so 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come*, Jam. 1. 12. *Shall receive a Crown of life*, &c. Thus they may argue from such places as these: they that do these works to which eternal life is promised, merit that life, but believers do those works, therefore they merit, *&c.* *Obj.* 5.

1. It is most false, that they that do that to which the reward of life is promised, do deserve that reward; for (1.) No man deserves that which is promised to him, unless by doing something which is adequate and proportionate to the thing promised, but, as before was declared) the good works of the Saints are not proportionate to eternal life, nor answerable in goodness and dignity to it, and so cannot deserve it. You may promise a man 100 *l.* for a days labour, which is not worth above two shillings, and can it then be said that he deserves your 100 *l*? (2.) A promise may be made to a man for doing that which he is bound to do, though nothing were given him, as when you promise a reward to a slave, who yet was before bound to do your work, and then his doing it doth not deserve what you give him. (3.) Justification is promised to them that believe, and repent; and will the Papists say that a man deserves to be justified by his Faith and Repentance? a King promiseth pardon and life to a Rebel, if he lay down his Arms; to a Robber, if he leave off his robbing; and can it be said that such do deserve pardon or life for laying down their Arms, or leaving off their wicked courses, when they were bound however to have done it, and the Prince was not bound to hire them to it? *Answ.*

2. To the min. propos. we answer, Eternal life is promised to good works, (so to speak for once, though improperly, the reward being promised not to good works themselves, but to them that do them) either, (1.) In the first Covenant, or Covenant of works, and then works are the sole and adequate condition of salvation, and a mans right to it; but then those works must be every way perfect, and answerable to the Law that requires them; and thus the min. prop. is most false, that any believer on earth doth that to which eternal life is promised; for none do all they should, and what they do, yet they do not as they should. (2.) Or in the second, the Covenant of grace, as where the *Crown of life* is promised to them *that love* God, *Jam.* 1. 12. and other

places of the like import: but then it would be conſidered, (1.) That life is promiſed not to works alone, nor to works meerly as works, (for that is the very tenor of the Law) but as joyned with, and proceeding from Faith; and then they are *neither the only, nor the compleat or adequate condition of obtaining* eternal life. (2.) That they, to whom this promiſe is made, are believers, ſuch as are accepted in Chriſt unto eternal life, even before thoſe works are wrought, and then their works are not *at all the condition of their being entitled to life*, though the evidence of their title to it, and the means of fitting them for it, they may be, (as hereafter more.) And ſo we ſay, that however believers do thoſe things to which eternal life in the Covenant of grace is promiſed, yet they are not entitled to it by their ſo doing, and therefore do much leſs deſerve it. This may ſuffice for the other places alledged. As for that of *Matth.* 19. 17. It is manifeſtly a legal command ſuited by our Saviour Chriſt to the queſtion of the young man, who ſought for life by the Law; our Saviour therefore accordingly anſwers him, and ſends him to the Law; *What good thing ſhall I do?* ſays the young man; *Keep the Commandments*, ſays Chriſt; if thou wilt have life by the Law, fulfill the righteouſneſs of the Law; if thou art only for *doing*, *do all* that God hath ſet thee to do; and this was the way to bring him to Faith, by convincing him of the impoſſibility of fulfilling the righteouſneſs of the Law, (which he farther doth by the following command, go *ſell all thou haſt*, &c. where he detects the young mans ſecret covetouſneſs whereby he had broken the Law,) and that after all his endeavours after a righteouſneſs of works, if he would at laſt be ſaved, he muſt quit his hopes of life by them, and look to Chriſt alone for it, ſeeing elſewhere it was not to be found.

Calv. *in loc.* *Neq; melius inanem juſtitiam refutare potuit, quam ſi illam ad legem exigeret.* Whitak.

Obj. 6. They argue eternal life to be deſerved by believers, becauſe it is given to them out of juſtice, and that it is ſo, they prove by 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 6, 7. *It is a righteous thing with God to recompence tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you that are troubled, reſt with us*, &c. 2 Tim. 4. 8. *A Crown of righteouſneſs*, Heb. 6. 10. *God is not unrighteous to forget your work, and labour of love*: and ſo, *Jam.* 1. 12. *Rev.* 2. 10. and ſuch like places.

Anſw. God gives eternal life to believers, not out of ſtrict juſtice in a proper ſenſe, but out of that which we call juſtice, or righteouſneſs of faithfulneſs, or conſtancy; and though he may be ſaid to reward both Saints and Sinners righteouſly, or out of righteouſneſs, yet not in the ſame way, or out of the ſame kind of righteouſneſs; it is indeed righteous for God to recompence the labours and ſufferings of his people, becauſe he hath promiſed ſo to do, and it is righteous that he ſhould act according to his own determination and promiſe, but it is not ſo righteous for him to do it, as that his recompencing them is formally an act of remunerative juſtice. And when the Apoſtle tells the Hebrews, that God is not unrighteous to forget their work and labour of love, he means no more,

than

than that he is not unfaithful, not unconſtant, he will not change, nor break his word. But is not the laſt day called the day of *the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds?* Rom. 2. 5, 6. The ſame day, as it is called the day of God's righteous judgment, ſo is likewiſe called the day of *redemption*, Eph. 4. 30. And a day of *mercy*, 2 Tim. 1. 18. *The Lord grant that he may find mercy in that day*; and a day of refreſhment, Act. 3. 19. *When the times of refreſhing ſhall come.* And as Chriſt is ſaid to come to judge the quick and the dead, 2 Tim. 4. 1. So likewiſe to appear to the *ſalvation* of believers, Heb. 9. 28. That great day therefore is properly a day of Mercy, of Redemption, of Refreſhment, of Salvation to Believers, and but figuratively a day of righteous judgment as to them, ſo far as it hath ſome reſemblance to a righteous judgment, becauſe God then gives eternal life with reſpect to ſomething going before, *viz.* the obedience and holineſs of thoſe whom he rewards, not as if it did really deſerve that reward, but becauſe it is the way in which God hath determined to act; he gives glory to thoſe that have lived graciouſly, happineſs to them that have continued in the exerciſe of holineſs. *Exc.* ἰμίλεα δίκαι ονεξτίας Θεῦ. *Anſw.*

Laſtly, they argue from thoſe places of Scripture where God is ſaid not to be an accepter of mens perſons, *Rom.* 2. 11. *For there is no reſpect of perſons with God*; Gal. 2. 6. *God accepteth no mans perſon*; 1 Pet. 1. 17. *Who, without reſpect of perſons, judgeth according to every mans work.* Hence, ſays *Bellarmine*, *reſpecting mens perſons is contrary to diſtributive juſtice, as when a Judge gives a reward without merit, or a greater reward to leſſer merits, or on the contrary. Therefore God, in giving rewards, conſiders mens merits, and according to the diverſity of them aſſigns them their ſeveral manſions in Heaven.* *Obj.* 7.

That God is no reſpecter of perſons we grant, and that accepting mens perſons is contrary to diſtributive juſtice we grant too; but what is that to us, who deny that God's rewarding the good works of the Saints, is an act of diſtributive juſtice? for it is (as was before proved) an act of Grace; and accepting of perſons hath no place in rewards of Grace, though thoſe rewards be never ſo much above the deſerts, or altogether without deſerts in the perſons ſo rewarded. They that laboured but one hour in the Vineyard, received as much as they that had been all the day at work, which ought not to have been according to diſtributive juſtice, but well might according to Grace. What God gives, he gives out of no ſtock but his own, and may he not *do what he will with his own*? What is it to *Bellarmine*, if God will give glory and bleſſedneſs to thoſe that never deſerved it of him? ſeeing he wrongs not others in what he gives to ſome, and he receives nothing from any to diſtribute to any: what God gives, he may, if he pleaſe, not give at all; or he may give out, and diſpence to whom, and as he ſees fit. *Anſw.* *Matth.* 20.

Several other Arguments *Bellarmine* brings to prove the merit of good works, but they are all of leſſer conſequence, and not like to prevail with

with any that can answer the seven already mentioned, which indeed are the most plausible of any he brings, and the very *seven locks* wherein the *great strength* of this great *Champion* lies, and these being shaven off, (let them grow again if they can) this *Romish Sampson* is but like another man. As for the testimonies he brings out of the Fathers, you need not fear them, and I shall not trouble you with them, having in the beginning given you an account in what sense they generally take the word merit, which makes nothing at all for the Papists cause.

Only one Argument more there is still behind, which, though all the Papists conceal, I will not: you find it, *Act.* 19. 25. *Ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.* I dare say *Demetrius* speaks the very heart of *Bellarmine*; only he was a mechanick, and a fool, and so *uttered all his mind*, whereas our Cardinal was a crafty Jesuite, and knew how to keep in his. But how to answer this Argument I know not, unless by granting the whole. That the doctrine of merits is a gainful doctrine, cannot be denied, when the art of meriting is so liberal an art: It first repleniſheth the Church-Treasury, which again, by the help of Indulgences, empties it self into the Pope's Exchequer. Only these good works suffer some alteration in the exchange, and by I know not what kind of new ferment in their last receptacle, what was merit in the Church Store-house, is in the Pope's purse transubstantiated into metal, which puts his Holiness out of a capacity of saying as *Peter* did, *Gold and silver have I none.* The sum is this; the Doctrine of merits is no doubt a fundamental Doctrine, Supererrogations are built upon it, Indulgences are built upon it, Purgatory it self, and Prayers for the dead are built upon it, and, not to go so far as the other World, how many good things in this life are built upon the foundation of Popish good works, many religious Houses, and many religious Orders, many a fair Monastery, and many a stately Temple, and many a fat Benefice. And who can say but the foundation must needs be precious, when the superstructure is so rich? Well then may the Popish Priests stickle for the principal, when the interest is all their own. Well may they contend for merits, as *pro Aris & focis*, as not only for their Altars, but for their Chimneys too, when it is the *zeal* of meriting that keeps their Kitchins *warm.* In a word, well may they *sacrifice to these nets, and burn incense to these drags, when by them their portion is made fat, and their meat plenteous.*

Act. 3. 6.

Hab. 1. 16.

But here two Quæries may be made.

Qu. 1. Upon what account are believers bound to the practice of good works, if they merit not by them?

Answ. Upon several, and good ones too: reason enough we have to perswade us to the practice of good works, though we place no merit in them.

1. God's command is of it self sufficient, though no other reason could be given. He hath commanded us to *be holy*, 1 Pet. 1. 15. *To exercise*

our ſelves *to godlineſs*; 1 Tim. 4. 7. To *follow peace and holineſs*; Hebr. 12. 14. To *put on bowels of mercies, kindneſs, humbleneſs of mind*, &c. Col. 3. 13. To be *ready to diſtribute, willing to communicate*; 1 Tim. 6. 18. And in a word, that *they who have believed in God, ſhould be careful to maintain good works*; Tit. 3. 8. God is our Sovereign, his will is our rule, and our reaſon; what he will have us do, we muſt do, and his command is ſufficient to make our actions not only lawful, but neceſſary, not only to warrant us in the doing of them, but oblige us to do them. And we need not doubt but our actions will be as acceptable to God, which are done out of compliance with his will, as any that are done with a deſign of meriting at his hands: Obedience will go as far as mercenarineſs.

2. Good works are the way in which God hath appointed us to walk in order to our obtaining eternal life. They are *via ad regnum*, the path of life, the way to God's Kingdom, the work we are to do ere we receive our reward, the race we are to run ere we be crowned. Though God ſave us not for them as meritorious cauſes of his ſaving us, yet thoſe that are capable of doing them, he doth not ordinarily ſave without them. *Eph.* 2. 10. *We are his workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works, which God hath before ordained, that we ſhould walk in them*, Heb. 12. 14. *Without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord.* Though eternal glory be not (as hath been proved) properly a reward, nor God's giving it an act of ſtrict juſtice, yet God hath (we acknowledge) determined to give it, *per modum præmii*, after the manner of a reward, in that he will not give men the glory he intends them till they have done him ſome ſervice, not treat them as Conquerors, who never fought his battel; not reſpect them as faithful ſervants, who have been ſluggards or loiterers. The *ſanctification of the Spirit* as well as *belief of the truth*, muſt go before *Salvation*, becauſe God hath *from the beginning choſen us to Salvation* by the one as well as the other, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 13.

Etſi ad metam nunquam pervenitur, niſi viam rectam ingrediamur, via tamen non eſt cauſa metæ. Whitak.

Twiſſ.

3. The practice of good works is a ſpecial means to ſtrengthen and encreaſe good habits in us; the actual exerciſe of Grace heightens the principle of Grace, doing good is the ordinary way whereby we grow better; while we employ our talents we add to our ſtock; we get Grace while we act it, and lay up for our ſelves by laying out for God. Active Chriſtians are generally the moſt thriving Chriſtians, they gather by ſcattering, and are enriched by their very expences. The more humility men act, the more humble they grow; and the more love they exerciſe, the more love they have. As the more we uſe our limbs, the more agile and nimble they are; and the farther a river runs, the broader it ſpreads.

4. Good works fit us for the reward: it is by them we are *made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light*, Col. 1. 12. Though by Faith we are entitled to that inheritance, becauſe we are *the children of God by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt*; Gal. 3. 26. *And if children, then heirs*;

heirs, Rom. 8. 17. Yet over and above our title to it, there is required in us a ſuitableneſs to, and fitneſs for it. The Father of the Prodigal firſt embraces and kiſſes his poor returning ſon, and then puts the robe upon him, the ring on his hand, and ſhooes on his feet; he firſt pardons him, and then adorns him, and at laſt brings him into his houſe and feaſts him; he fits him for his entertainment ere he brings him to it. God's pardoning a ſinner is one thing, and his fully ſaving him is another; his receiving him into favour, and receiving him into heaven; his giving him a right to the inheritance, and giving him the actual poſſeſſion of it: the firſt is done in a ſinners juſtification, the other in his final ſalvation: but between theſe two comes in a third, which is God's *working* in him a fitneſs and meetneſs for that ſalvation, which meetneſs conſiſts in a temper of ſpirit agreeable to, and capable of ſuch enjoyments as are expected by, and ſetled upon them that are the heirs of Glory. And indeed, if we look into it we ſhall find, that there is not only a congruity that they who are to be made happy, ſhould firſt be made holy, (in that it would be unbeſeeming the wiſdom and holineſs of God to let them enjoy him, who never loved him; or crown them with everlaſting bleſſedneſs, who never prized or ſought it) but a neceſſity too, in that unholy ſouls have no capacity for true happineſs, meerly natural hearts are not ſuited to a ſupernatural good; heavenly enjoyments are above the reach of ſenſual creatures, and the faculty, till elevated, and raiſed by Grace, would be ſo much below its object, that it could take no delight in it. Now grace or holineſs in the heart, is that very temper I ſpeak of, which makes a man capable of, and fit for glory; a ſupernatural principle for a ſupernatural happineſs; and though God begins this frame, and infuſeth ſomething of this principle in the work of regeneration, yet it is further ſtrengthened by the exerciſe of grace, and a courſe of good works, which we therefore ſay do fit men for Heaven by encreaſing Grace in them, wherein their fitneſs conſiſts. Mens abounding in good works is the way to heighten thoſe graces from whence they proceed, and the heightning their graces is the ripening them for their glory. And though God himſelf, as the Author of all Grace, is the principal Agent in carrying on this work of ſanctification in them, and he who doth gradually *work* them for the glory he intends them, yet they themſelves having in their new birth received a new life, and new power from God, ſo far as they are active in the exerciſe of Grace, (which under him they are) ſo far likewiſe they are active in preparing themſelves for Glory, and therefore deeply concerned to live in the daily exerciſe of good works, as the means of preparing them for it.

Luke 15.

Operatio divina neceſſaria eſt, quia mutari nos oportet, & novas Creaturas effici, priuſquam participes eſſe poſſumus cœleſtium beneficiorum. Nam in nobis nihil eſt aliud quam ſumma ineptitudo ad bonum ſpirituale ſive intelligendum, ſive faciendum, ſive denique capiendum. Daven. *in primum ad* Coloſſ.

2 *Cor.* 5. 5. κατεργάζεσθαι, *rem expolire rudem, & informam*; Camero, *apud* Lxxii. κατεργάζεσθαι τὰ ζῶα. Exod. 35. 33. Jer. 31. 18, 18. *Acti agimus.*

5. Good works bear witneſs to the goodneſs of our Faith, they evidence it to be true, and of the right kind, not counterfeit, not ſophiſticate. And therefore we are greatly concerned to maintain good works, that thereby we may be able to aſſert our Faith againſt a quarrelling conſcience, or an accuſing devil, which otherwiſe we ſhall never be able to do.

60. We acknowledg that only to be a true justifying Faith, and so of the right stamp, which *purifies the heart*, Act. 15. 9. *Works by love*, Gal. 5. 6. encourageth, and promotes, and produceth holiness, and *shews* it self by *works*, *Jam.* 2. 18. So that if Faith be the root of good works, good works are the fruit of Faith; and how then shall we know the root but by the fruit? So that as if the Devil or Conscience charge us with disobedience to God, and breach of his Law, and that therefore we are liable to the curse of the Law, we plead in our defence, that though we are not without sin, yet we are not without Faith neither; though we have offended God, yet we have believed in Christ: so if we be accused of hypocrisie, or unbelief, and told that we have not received Christ by Faith, and therefore are liable to the woe of the Gospel, we then produce our good works, a course of holiness, as the undoubted signs and evidences of the reallity and power of our Faith: and in this sense we may say, that as we our selves must be justified by our Faith, so our Faith must be justified by our works.

6. Hereby they further our assurance, and help on our comforts. The great comfort of a Believer comes in by his Faith, *Rom.* 15. 13. And therefore usually so much comfort a Christian hath, as he hath evidence of the truth and sincerity of his Faith. While it is uncertain to him whether his Faith be right, he can have little comfort in it; little *joy and peace in believing*, while he knows not whether he really believes or not. The same we may say of other Graces, so far as they conduce to the consolation of a Christian, a believer can enjoy little comfort in them, if he perpetually doubt of them; while he suspects himself to be an hypocrite, it is no marvel if he taste not the sweetness of sincerity. Now our good works (as before) give evidence to the truth of our Faith, and so likewise to the sincerity of other graces, as habits are known by their actings, and we judg what a fountain is by the streams that come from it. And therefore they that desire the comfort of Grace, must be diligent in the exercise of Grace; they that are concerned for their own peace and joy, are consequently so concerned to live, and act, as that they may attain that end. Beside, we might add, that the applause and commendation of a sanctified Conscience, upon the performance of good works, and that inward secret delight which is usually the concomitant of gracious actings, (which, so far as we are renewed, are grateful to that new nature which is within us) is no small part of a Christians pleasure, and therefore no weak inducement to diligence and constancy in such a course.

7. We are bound to the practice of good works, that so we may be conformed to God and Christ. Christ, when on earth, *went about doing good*, Act. 10. 38. He did not only abound in holiness, but activity; had not only a fulness of habitual grace in him, whereby he was always in a fitness and readiness to do good, but did continually exercise himself in it, and that he did, not only that he might fulfil the Law, but give us an

example, and so for the imitation of believers, as well as satisfaction of divine justice: We therefore are commanded, *so to walk even as he also walked*, 1 Joh. 2. 6. And the Apostle *Paul* bids us *be followers of God*, Eph. 5. 1. And *Peter*, *be holy in all manner of conversation*, (and so practically) *as he who hath called us is holy*, 1 Pet. 1. 15. And our Saviour Christ bids us *be perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect*, Matth. 5. 48. It is our perfection to be like God, not in Infiniteness, Immensity, Independency, Attributes wholly incommunicable to us, unimitable by us, but in righteousness and holiness; this was our primitive perfection in innocency, and will be our final perfection in glory; and still the more we encrease in righteousness and holiness, the more perfect we grow, because the more like God; and the more good works we do, still the more we go on in grace toward perfection and conformity to God. Men generally look on it as a desirable thing to be like God in one way or other: let but those desires be regulated, and carried toward that likeness to him, which they may attain, and ought to seek, and that will be inducement enough to the practice of good works, as the most proper means to bring them to that conformity.

8. Good works are the end of good principles. God gives us grace that we should exercise it, puts a price into our hands that we should use it. Exercise is the immediate end of habits. We are not to look upon grace as an idle quality, a dormant principle, something to lie by us, and be sluggish within us. It is not to be as a candle under a bushel, but on a candle-stick; not as mony hoarded up, but laid out. And the more we exercise it, the better, because so much the more we answer God's end in bestowing it upon us.

9. Lastly, God is most glorified by our good works, *Joh.* 15. 8. And therefore we are the more to abound in them. The more the excellency and beauty of grace appears, so much the more God is glorified, and the exercise of grace doth most of all discover the beauty of it. Holiness is but God's image, and if the image be so ravishing, what then (will men infer) is he that is resembled by it? if there be so much lustre in a beam, what is there in the Sun? Grace in the creature is but the expression or imitation of some attribute in God to which it answers, and so the more grace we act, & the more good we do, so much the more we declare what excellencies are in God, or in *Peter*'s phrase, *shew forth his virtues*, 1 Pet. 2. 9. So that good works are the most effectual way of glorifying God, because the most convincing demonstration of those perfections which are in God.

And is not here reason enough for the practice of good works? Is it nothing that God hath commanded them, that they are the way to glory, and fit us for glory, encrease grace, and discover grace, help on our comforts, and promote God's honour, unless withal we merit Heaven by them, and oblige God to reward us for them?

Qu. 2. If good works are not truly meritorious, why then, and upon what account doth God reward them?

Answ. 1. Because he hath promised so to do, and he is constant and unchangeable, and will not be worse than his word.

2. Because of the love he bears to, and the delight he takes in holiness, and those good works which are the fruits of it. *The righteous Lord loveth righteousness*, Psal. 11. 7. God delights first in himself, and next in that which comes neerest to him, and most resembles him, as holiness doth, the actings of which in good works, is but the beaming out of his image in the soul; and it is not strange that God should delight in his own image. Beside that, *good works* are *God's works*, they not only resemble him, but come from him, and then well may he delight in them, and that he may shew how much he doth so, he bountifully rewards them.

3. To encourage men to the practice of them, by the hopes of the reward. Though obedience be our duty, even without consideration of the reward, yet to enliven our desires, and put more vigour into our endeavours after it, he sets the Crown in our view, and assures us that if we *abound always in the work of the Lord, our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord* 1 Cor. 15. *ult.*

Something from this Doctrine we may learn for our information in the truth, and something for our instruction as to duty. Use.

1. For the former, we see here,

1. How much the best of Saints are beholden to the Lord Jesus Christ, for purchasing life and glory for them, which, by all their good works, they could never have done, though they were a thousand times more than they are. Had not Christ made the purchase, they could never have received the inheritance: had not he laid down the price, they could never have had a title or possession. They might work their hearts out of their bodies, ere they could work their souls into Heaven. All the grace they ever have, or act in this life, could never deserve the least degree of glory they receive. So fair an Estate, so rich an Inheritance, so weighty a Crown, so transcendent a Blessedness is fit only for so great a Purchaser as the Lord Jesus Christ to buy out. They might as well purchase a Kingdom in the World with a single penny, as everlasting Glory with all their good works. What-ever title they have to a future happiness, what-ever hopes of it, what-ever rest, and peace, and joy they expect in it, they owe all to Christ, and are his debtors for all. They owe him more than a whole eternity of praises will ever recompence. How miserable would the best of Saints have been, if Christ had not merited for them? How should they ever have obtained eternal life, got a place in Heaven, or indeed have escaped everlasting burnings, had it not been for Christ's undertakings? When they had been working and labouring all their days, they would have lost their labour at last. They might have prayed, and heard, and given their goods to feed the

poor, and their bodies to feed the flames, they might have done all they could, and ſuffered all their enemies would, and yet have fallen ſhort of a reward. One ſin committed by them, would have done more to ſhut Heaven againſt them, than all their good works could to open it to them.

2. How unreaſonable is their pride? how unpardonable is their folly that boaſt of, and put confidence in their own good works? That ever men ſhould think God to be their debtor, and that they have him in bonds to them! That ever they ſhould have ſuch high thoughts of ſuch pitiful things as their own works! Sure they have little knowledge of themſelves that have ſuch great conceits of themſelves; know little of their ill deſerts, that think they have any good ones; they have cheap thoughts of God's grace and Chriſt's merits, that do ſo magnify their own performances. *David*, and *Paul*, and all the ancient Saints were of another mind; they durſt not abide God's trial, nor confront his judgment with the choiceſt of their works. They be-like were Saints of a leſſer ſize, and their graces and good works of a lower allay: our Popiſh Saints have over-top'd them in holineſs, are Giants to them: *Suarez* and *Vaſquez* have got the ſtart of *Job* and *David*, and have found out a way to Heaven unknown to all that went formerly thither. *Jacob*, poor man, counted himſelf *leſs than the leaſt of God's mercies*, but theſe count themſelves worthy of the greateſt of them. The 24 Elders, *Rev.* 4. 10. *Caſt down their Crowns* before him that ſits on the Throne, in token that they had received them from him; but Papiſts ſcorn to do ſo, they think they have *won* them, and therefore may *wear* them; and inſtead of giving Glory, and Honour, and thanks to him that liveth for ever, they take them to themſelves, at leaſt ſhare them with him. The Lord tells the Iſraelites, *Deut.* 9. 6. *That he gave them not that good Land to poſſeſs it for their righteouſneſs*, ſpeaking of the earthly *Canaan*; but theſe audacious merit-mongers think that even the heavenly one is given them for theirs. Great Saints no doubt they are, and well deſerve to be canonized, when (if you will believe them) they deſerve to be ſaved.

Job. 9. 15. and 40. 4. *Pſal.* 143. 2. *Gen.* 32. 10.

3. And yet more egregious is their folly, in expecting advantage by the merits of others, and thinking to eke out their own righteouſneſs by borrowing of their neighbours. If no good works of the Saints merit any thing at God's hands, then the Popiſh Treaſury is quite empty, and his Holineſs is a meer bankrupt, Supererrogations fail, Indulgences fail, and there is no borrowing from *Peter* to ſupply *Paul*. If the beſt have no merits at all, ſure they have none ſuperfluous, none to ſpare. The wiſe Virgins, *Matth.* 25. have no more oil than will ſerve for themſelves, and are not they fooliſh ones that think to accommodate their friends? and they yet more fooliſh that hope to borrow of them? The Scripture ſpeaks indeed of a *ſuperfluity of naughtineſs* in mens hearts, but it no-where ſpeaks of a ſuperfluity of goodneſs in their

hearts

hearts or lives. A redundance of merit we acknowledg in Christ, *unsearchable riches, all fulness*; but woe to them that seek for the like redundance of merit among men. Ask the old Patriarchs, and Prophets, and Apostles, to lend you some of their merits, and they will all tell you they never had any of their own, they were all beholden to Christ, and to him you must go as well as they; the Church store-house cannot furnish you.

2. For instruction in point of duty: learn hence,

1. To be humble, and acknowledge the insufficiency of all you do, to deserve any thing at God's hands. Own your selves as *unclean things*, and your *righteousnesses as filthy rags*. Do but study your hearts, the workings and lustings, the inclination and temper of them; study your actions and ways, the best as well as worst; your duties, and choicest services; and study God's Law, the purity, holiness, spirituality, and extensiveness of it; what it forbids, what it requires, how far it reaches, and compare both together, and then be proud if you can, boast if you can, trust in your own works if you can; and, in one word to say all, be Papists if you can. Isa. 64. 6.

2. Learn to admire the grace of God in rewarding your works: it is much that he accepts them, and what is it then that he rewards them? It is much that he doth not damn you for them, (seeing they are all defiled, and have something of sin cleaving to them) and what is it then that he crowns them? You would admire the bounty and munificence of a man, that should give you a Kingdom for taking up a straw at his foot, or give you an hundred thousand pounds for paying him a penny-rent you owed him: how then should you adore the rich grace, and transcendent bounty of God in so largely recompencing such mean services, in setting a Crown of Glory upon your heads, as the reward of those works you can scarce find in your hearts to call good ones? you will even blush one day, to see your selves so much honoured for what you are ashamed of, and are conscious to your selves you have deserved nothing by. You will wonder then to see God recompencing you for doing what was your duty to do, and what was his work in you; giving you Grace, and crowning that Grace, enabling you to do things acceptable to him, and then rewarding you as having done them. Take heed therefore now of rivalling God's grace, or Christ's merits, of inverting his praises, and ascribing any thing to your selves which belongs only to him. Set the Crown upon the right Head; let him have the honour of the work that hath done it, the glory of your reward that hath purchased it. Say with your selves, *What am I, and what are my services, that ever God should thus plentifully reward them? I never pray'd but I sinn'd, never confessed sin, never begg'd pardon of it, strength against it, but I did at the same time commit it; I never heard a Sermon, received a Sacrament, did any good duty, but with some mixture of coldness, deadness, distractedness. I never had any Grace but what God gave me,*

Cum Deus coronet merita nostra nihil aliud coronat quam munera sua, August. *contra* Pelag. *Epist.* 105.

me, nor acted any but what he stirr'd up in me. All the good I ever had, or did, I received from him, and therefore I owe all to him. I am a thousand ways his debtor, for my life and being, for the good things of this life, for the means and offer of eternal life, for the knowledge of his will, conviction of sin, restraint from sin, the change of my heart, the reformation of my ways, the graces of his Spirit, the priviledges of his children conferr'd upon me: I am his debtor for all the evils he hath delivered me from, all the good he hath offered me, wrought in me, done by me. And doth God take so much notice of such poor things? Will he indeed reward such weak endeavours, such lame performances? Must I live in Heaven, that never deserved to live on earth? Must I wear the Crown of Righteousness, who never deserved any thing but the punishment of mine iniquities? Must eternal glory and honour be my portion, who have deserved nothing better than shame, and everlasting contempt? *I have nothing to boast of, nothing to glory in. I must* cry Grace, Grace. *All I have, and to eternity am to have, is Grace. The foundation of my Salvation was laid in Grace, and so will the top-stone too. It was Grace sent Christ to redeem me, and Grace will send him at last fully to save me. I have received all from God, and therefore desire to return the praise of all to him: It is but just that all should be ascribed to him, from whom all came.*

Zech. 4. 7.

3. Labour so to exercise your selves in, and to good works, as yet to put all your confidence in God's grace. I do not go about to cry down good works, or discourage the practice of them, but take you off from confidence in them; nor to dissuade you from that exercise of holiness whereby God may be glorified, and your souls advantaged, but that sinful reliance on your own righteousness, which is God's dishonour, and your loss. Be as holy as you will, do as much good as you will, abound as much in the work of the Lord, and walk as circumspectly and closely with God as you please, (and the Lord make you abound more and more) only, if you value your comforts, if you love your souls, if you are concerned for God's glory, take heed of putting any the least confidence in what you do, or expecting to merit a reward by your most laborious working. It is the great art and wisdom of a Christian to joyn the exercise of Faith and Holiness together, and yet distinguish their different relations to his salvation; not to give so much to the one, as to exclude the other; but so to believe, as still to own the usefulness of works; and so to work, as to see the necessity of Faith: to believe like one that had no works, and to work like one that were to be saved by his works. In a word, to be diligent in good works, but not put confidence in them, and so to acknowledge their necessity in their place, but not their meritoriousness. He is a believer of the right stamp, who neither contemns Christ's Law, nor dishonours Christ's Grace, but is alike an enemy to *Antinomian* Faith, and *Antichristian* works.

If you do trust in your good works, your best duties and services; consider that,

1. If

1. You do but lean upon a broken reed, build upon a ſandy foundation, which will at laſt fail you, diſappoint you, undo you. What a defeat will it be to expect to be ſaved by your merits, when, at laſt, it appears you have no merits; to fancy your ſelves worthy of a reward, when it appears you have been worthy of nothing? And as ſure as the Scripture is true, you can merit no more at God's hands by all your ſervices, than a debtor can of his Creditor, by paying him ſome ſmall part of what he owes him; and your very confidence in your works will bereave you of any benefit by Chriſt's merits: Chriſt alone muſt be truſted in, relied on, and glorified by you. You muſt not think to be parcel-Saviours with him; either he will be your only Saviour, or not at all your Saviour; your only righteouſneſs, or not at all your righteouſneſs: if you divide Chriſt's honour, you loſe his help; your works cannot be your righteouſneſs, and Chriſt will not; and ſo you will *loſe the things you have wrought*, by thinking to gain too much by them; miſs of the ſubſtance while you catch at the ſhadow. 2 Joh. ver. 8.

2. However you truſt in your works while you live, you will not dare to do it when you die. When men come to die, and cloſe the eyes of their bodies, uſually thoſe of their minds are moſt open, and as their reflections are then moſt ſtrong, ſo their proſpect is moſt clear. The nearer they are to death, and judgment, and eternity, the truer apprehenſions they have of them: they then beſt ſee how holy the Judge is, how impartial his ſearch, how righteous his ſentence; and how do they fear him then, with whom they made ſo bold before? How doth the confidence of their lives ſhrink at their death? Alas, they did not think either God ſo ſtrict as now they believe him, or their goodneſs ſo imperfect as now they come to find it. They ſee the neceſſity of grace, which before they ſlighted; and the inſufficiency of works, which before they idolized. Mercy is mercy indeed to a dying man, and works are but works, and not merits. Let me ſee the face of the Papiſt, that, when he is coming to the higheſt tribunal, dares truſt to his good works, and put in his claim to the Crown of Glory upon the account of his merits, and tell God to his face; *Lord, I have done all thy will, and done it as I ſhould; or if I have fallen ſhort in ſome things, I have out-done it in others: I have heard ſo many Maſſes ſaid, ſo many* Pater noſters, *and* Ave Maria's, *obſerved ſo many Canonical hours, made ſo many Confeſſions, done ſo many Penances, given ſo many Alms, gone ſo many Pilgrimages, faſted ſo many Lents, mortified my fleſh with hard lodging, and harder blows: and this is as much as Heaven is worth; thou art now a debtor to me: I have done my work, I challenge my reward, let juſtice be done me, and the Crown be given me. I ask no more than I have laboured for, and deſerved at thy hands. It is but juſt that I ſhould be joynt heir with Chriſt, ſeeing I have been joynt Purchaſer with him.* I am perſwaded there is not the Papiſt upon earth, unleſs he be moſt bruitiſhly ignorant of the Nature and Laws of God, and of his own heart, that will dare in a dying hour thus to be-

ſpeak

ſpeak him. And how fooliſh is it for men to boaſt of that now, which they will not dare to boaſt of then; and build upon a foundation in their life, which they muſt be forced to relinquiſh at their death? Remember, Chriſtians, there is a time to die, as well as to live; a time to be judged in, as well as to act in; a day of recompence, as well as a day of ſervice: and therefore bethink your ſelves before-hand; ſee your confidence be rightly placed. Expect your ſalvation from him only now, from whom you will expect it at laſt; and put your ſouls into his hands now, into whoſe you would then moſt willingly commit them: ſet aſide your works, though not as to the practice of them, yet as to your confidence in them. Eye Chriſt alone as to the buſineſs of your juſtification, acceptance, reward. Labour for ſuch a Faith in Chriſt, and free Grace, as will ſupport you under the weakneſs and imperfections of your preſent righteouſneſs, and encourage you againſt the terrors of approaching death. In a word, ſo believe and hope now, that you are going on toward Eternity, as you would do when you are ſtepping into it.

SERM.

SERMON XII.

The Doctrine of Juſtification is dangerouſly corrupted in the Roman Church.

Rom. 3. 24. *Being juſtified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt.*

THE Apoſtle, in theſe words, (and the following) gives an exact account of the Doctrine of Juſtification, dictated to him by the Spirit of Truth. And this will be the beſt ground we can proceed on, to diſcover the errors by which it is corrupted. That is our preſent buſineſs to which I haſten, only firſt opening the words by a brief touch upon them.

Being juſtified] To be juſtified, is to be freely accepted of God as righteous, ſo as to have pardon and title to life, upon the account of Chriſt's righteouſneſs. We cannot be accepted as righteous, till we be acquitted from guilt. The Apoſtle deſcribes Juſtification by remiſſion of ſins, *Rom.* 4. 5, 6. And being accepted as righteous, we are accepted to life. (The Apoſtle calls it *Juſtification of Life*, Romans 5. 17, 18, 21.) This is upon the account of Chriſt's righteouſneſs. We cannot be juſtified upon our own account; for ſo we are condemned, and cannot but be ſo, nor upon other account but Chriſt and his righteouſneſs; for there's no juſtification without righteouſneſs; and none ſufficient but that of Chriſt, which the Apoſtle includes in the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.

Freely by his Grace] The Lord juſtifies by his Grace, and this acts freely. That which moves him is called, *Tit.* 3. 4. χρηςότης φιλανθρωπία, Kindneſs and Love, which, *ver.* 7. is Grace; (that being juſtified, τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι, by his Grace) ſo Juſtification is χάρισμα, the free gift, *Rom.* 5. 16. δωρεὰν ἐκ χάριτι, the gift by grace, *ver.* 15. This grace, as it is free mercy, ſo it acts like it ſelf, δωρεὰν, freely, (the word uſed, *Mat.* 10. 8. δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, freely ye have received it) he gives it freely to thoſe who have no merit to deſerve it: there is none in us; what there was, was in Chriſt. It is

Through the Redemption.] Redemption is deliverance by a price, or valuable conſideration. This price was the bloud of Chriſt *ver.* 25.

Rom. 5. 9. *Eph.* 1. 6, 7. His death, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. His obedience, *Rom.* 5. 19. His righteousness, *ver.* 18.

We may view the Text distinctly in three parts.

1. Believers are justified.
2. Freely by his Grace.
3. Through the Redemption that is in Christ.

Against each of these the Papists have advanced several errors of pernicious consequence; and thereby dangerously corrupted the whole Doctrine of Justification.

1. That a sinner may be saved, the Scriptures declare that he must be both justified and sanctified: the Romanists, as if one of those were but requisite, call that Justification, which in Scripture is Sanctification; and that which in Scripture is Justification, they admit not, as distinct from inherent righteousness.

The Apostle *Paul*, who most insists upon the Doctrine of Justification, delivers these two as distinct things, 1 *Cor.* 11. and else-where. He ascribes Justification commonly to the bloud of Christ; as in the Text, and *Rom.* 5. 8, 9. Sanctification to the Spirit of Christ, *Tit.* 3. 5.

However the Papists promiscuous use of the words might be tollerated, if they did not confound the things, and contend that we are formally justified by that which is the form and essence of Sanctification, *viz.* inherent righteousness. The danger is that which the Apostle would have the Jews avoid, when he expresseth his hearty desire that they might be saved; *Rom.* 10. 13. *For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God.* The Papists trust to their own righteousness for acceptance and life, and will be justified, in the sight of God, by that which indeed is imperfect and culpable, and so liable to be condemned; and being convinced that they cannot be justified by an imperfect righteousness, therefore they will have their inherent righteousness to be perfect, *a* not so perfect as it will be in Heaven, but so as to be free from *b* sin, and to answer the demands of the Law, since they know otherwise it would not justifie them. And this fancy of a sinless perfection runs them into many absurd and pernicious conceits.

a *Quod dicebamus—justitiam & charitatem in hac vita non esse perfectam comparatione duntaxat ad illam patriæ reputandum est.* Domenicus a Soto de nat. & grat. L. 3. cap. 4. p. 134.

b The Council of *Trent* calls it *Justitiam candidam & immaculatam, Sess.* 5. 67. In the *Trent* Catechism it is *Divina qualitas in anima inhærens—quæ animarum vestrarum omnes maculas delet ea (charitas) siquidem, est verissima, plenissima, perfectissima, justitia*; Bellarm. *de Justif.* L. 2. c. 16. p 806.

For they are hereby obliged to maintain, that no corruption in their natures, (after Baptism) no aversion to God, no inclination to evil, though habitual and fixed, has any thing of sin in it. No, nor any c vicious ha-

c *Habitus justitiæ contrarius est habitus injustitiæ, quia non est peccatum sed vitium, ex malis actibus contractum, quale etiam in justifica-*

tis

tis reperiri poteſt, ibid. p. 805. *Diſpoſitio vel habitus acquiſitus Vitium eſt, non peccatum, de amiſſ. grat.* L. 5. c. 19. p. 337. *Omnes ſiquidem leges præcipiunt vel prohibent actus non habitus.* Melch. Canus *de pœnit.* p. 870.

bits acquired by frequent acts of ſin; all is ſinleſs that is in the ſoul, when Grace or Charity is once therein. And ſo there's no need of mortification, no poſſibility of it: for there is nothing of ſin in them to be mortified, no habit or diſpoſition, natural or acceſſary, upon which the charge of ſin can be truly fixed. And as they leave no need of, no place for mortification; ſo after they have diſcarded the Scripture Juſtification, to make way for a Sanctification to juſtifie them; they deal no better with that neither. Whether it be taken for the firſt riſe of Holineſs, which is properly regeneration; or for the growth and increaſe of it, which is the Sanctification that the Scripture calls for commonly under this notion (they will have it to be a ſecond Juſtification). As for the firſt Sanctification, by their principles, it excludes all ſin, and is, ſo far, perfect or nothing, and ſo indeed it is a meer *chimæra*, ſuch a thing as God never gave, never promiſed, as no meer man on earth ever had; *Job.* 1. 18. Yet this and nothing elſe muſt juſtifie them, and make them worthy of eternal life: and thus they will be juſtified, and ſaved by a meer fancy, or nothing.

As for growth and increaſe in Holineſs, (which is the Sanctification that the Scripture makes ſo neceſſary, and calls for with ſo much importunity) this they make ſuperfluous and unneceſſary. No man needs deſign or endeavour it; for what needs he look after more of that which he hath already in *d* perfection? They have it in ſuch perfection, as there is no culpable defect in it; it is no ſin to have no more, (elſe it would not be ſufficient to their Juſtification) and what neceſſity is there to labour for that which it is no ſin to want? Their Doctrine of Juſtification by a righteouſneſs of their own inculpably perfect, obliges them to hold, that what Grace they receive at firſt, though in the very loweſt degree, is all that God commands, and makes neceſſary (if he commanded more, the want of more would be culpable). So that every degree of Holineſs or Charity above the leaſt of all, is only *e*, *ſub conſilio*, meer matter of counſel; which they may neglect without contracting ſo much as the guilt of a *f* venial fault.

d *Nulla enim eſt charitas ſimpliciter imperfecta -- ſufficit autem quilibet gradus charitatis ut quis ſervet verbum*, i. e. *præcepta Domini*, Bellarm. *de Purgat.* 22. c. 3. p. 1381.

e *Si non peccо (ex ſententia S.* Thomæ*) ſi amem Deum niſi uno gradu amoris, certe non teneor in rigore amplius amare: implicat enim contradictionem, quod non peccem, non faciendo quod facere teneor: ergo ſi addam alterum gradum amoris, amo plus, quam tenetur, atq; eo modo facio actum ſupererogationis, ut Conſil.* Bellarm. *de Monach.* L. 2. c. 13. p. 1162.

f *Nec illæ (leges) divinæ conſultoriæ etiam ad venialia obligent.* Navar. *manual.* C. 23. n. 49. p. 564. & c. 21. n. 43. Silveſt. *ſum. verbum inobed. Sſ.* 2.

Thus all progreſs in holineſs is hereby ſupercreded: after the firſt ſtep they ſin not, though they never make another. And all the de-

grees of holiness above the lowest, are unnecessary, they may be without all of them, safely and inculpably. In short, if the want of all other degrees, but the least of all, be a sin; if the lowest degree of all be not righteousness in perfection: by their principles, they are not justified, and cannot be saved; and so the main stress of their Salvation lies upon a gross and palpable delusion; that such a righteousness is perfect, as is furthest of all from perfection, and in a degree next to nothing.

Secondly, they seem to include remission of sins in Justification, but it is not that pardon which the Gospel offers, but another thing under the disguise of the same word. And particularly, such as lies cross to every part of the Text. Their pardon is not an act of God, absolving a guilty person upon the account of satisfaction given; but an act g or consequent of infused Grace or Charity within us, abolishing sin, and not otherwise taking away the guilt, but by taking away the being of it.

g *Charitas culpam delet per actum suum proprium, pœnam autem tollet per opera satisfactoria quæ ipsa charitas imperat*, Bellarm. *de Purgat.* Lib. 2. c. 3. p. 1381.

The best account I can give of it, in brief, is this, collected out of their chief Authors. They observe in sin the fault and the guilt; and the guilt either as it is the desert of sin, and the offender worthy of punishment; or, as it is an obligation to punishment, and the sinner bound to suffer it. The former is, with them, *h reatus culpæ*; the latter, *reatus pœnæ*: and all this is taken away by Charity, or infused Grace. *i* The fault in sin is the *aversion*, or the souls turning away from God: but Charity, or inherent Grace, brings it back again, and joyns it to him, and thereby the fault is remitted. Now the fault being gone, by vertue of inherent Grace, the guilt must vanish too: for where there is no fault, there is no desert of punishment; and where there is no desert of it, there can be no obligation to it. So that infused Grace having left sin no being, by necessary *k* consequence the guilt is taken away together with it. Accordingly *Bellarmine* shews particularly how this Charity takes away all that belongs to sin, the aversion from God, the stain of sin, the desert of punishment, and the obligation to it: and the sum of all is this. *l* The formal effect of habitual Charity is the abolishing of sin: and with him and others, remission of sins, and infusion of Grace, are but one and the same *m* motion; whereof these are the two terms; as it is in the diffusion of light, and the dispelling of darkness.

h *Reatus culpæ, qui est dignitas odii, indignitas gratiæ, & meritum pœnæ: Reatus pœnæ, id est ordinatio sive obligatio ad luendam pœnam*, Bellarm. *de amiss. grat.* L. 5. c. 19. p. 337.

i *Quando per gratiam remittitur culpa tollitur aversio animæ a deo in quantum per gratiam anima Deo conjungitur.* Aquinas 3. q. 85. *art.* 4. *Ideo ex hoc dicitur culpa mortalis remitti quod per gratiam tollitur aversio mentis a Deo, ad primum artic.* 4 *quæst.* 85.

k *Per consequens simul tollitur reatus pœnæ, id. ibid. non possunt, non tolli, si donum illud præcisserit*; says Bellarmine of the guilt and offence of sin, *de Justific.* L. 12. c. 16. p. 806.

l *Habemus primum effectum formalem justitiæ, id est Charitatis habitualis, divinitus infusæ, esse de medio tollere, ac delere peccatum, id. ibid.*

m *Id. ibid.* L. 2. c. 2. p. 766. And *Soto* (after *Aquinas*) *de nat. & grat.* L. 2. c. 18. p. 110.

So

So that this Doctrine leaves ſinners no hopes of pardon in this life, or for ever: for hereby ſin is not pardoned, till by inherent Charity it be quite expelled, which is not in this life: or till the ſinner be rendred not worthy of puniſhment, meerly by vertue of ſuch Charity, which will never be.

However, thoſe who underſtand what pardon is, by the light of Scripture will ſoon diſcover that this is not the Goſpel-pardon; to go no farther than the Text, it claſhes (as I ſaid) with every part of it. For, firſt, by their account, Pardon is by a phyſical, or ſuper-phyſical act of Charity within us: whereas the firſt word in the Text, (δικαιώμενοι) ſhews that pardon in Juſtification is a judicial act of God towards us. The perpetual uſe of the word in Scripture aſſures us of this: it implies a judicial proceeding, and is ſet oppoſite to condemning or accuſing. For a Judge to acquit one at the Barr, accuſed in order to condemnation, is not to qualifie him, (that would be to prevent miſdemeanors for the future) but to diſcharge from what he is accuſed of, as paſt: nor can they give any inſtances in Scripture of ſuch uſe of the word as will bear their notion. Indeed, it is againſt the uſage of the World, and common ſenſe, that a man ſhould be ſaid to pardon one, by indueing him with good qualities. Secondly, the pardon in Juſtification is free. A gift of undeſerved Grace (as the next words expreſs it). But their pardon is not free, neither in it ſelf, nor in that which they make the riſe of it (*inherent Charity*). They deface the freeneſs of it in both, by a conceit of their own merit; and ſo transform it into another thing than the pardon of the Goſpel is, which ſhall be made apparent when we come to the ſecond part of the Text. Thirdly, the Goſpel-pardon is intirely through the redemption that is in Chriſt (as the next words repreſent it): But their pardon excludes this redemption, or leaves it but a minute and remote influence into it, if any at all.

The Lord, by Chriſt's undertaking, is moved to ſhew mercy to ſinners; he ſhews it by infuſing Charity into their hearts, this takes away the fault or being of ſin, and that being gone, the deſert of puniſhment vaniſheth, and by conſequence the obligation to it. So we muſt paſs ſeveral ſtages before we can diſcover what the redemption of Chriſt hath to do in the pardon of a ſinner; and when we have gone ſo far, may be at a loſs too, as they order the matter: but that will better be ſhewed in the laſt propoſal.

Moreover, though they will have their pardon do more than meer remiſſion can do; yet they make it fall ſhort of that which is moſt proper for pardon to do. It quite diſſolves not the obligation to puniſhment,

Pœna damni eſt maxima pœnarum,-- Omnis qui in purgatorio degit, cruciatur ſaltem hac pœna damni quæ eſt omnium maxima, Aquinas *in* 4 *Diſt.* 20. 41. *art.* 2. *vid.* Bellarm. *de Purgat.* L. 2. c. 14. *Si ibi eſt verus ignis, erit omnino acerrimus; cum ad hoc ſolum ſit inſtitutus, ut ſit inſtrumentum juſtitiæ divinæ, ſi non ſit ignis verus, erit aliquid horribilius, quam Deus parare potuit, qui potentiam ſuam in hoc oſtendere voluit*, p. 1400.

ment, but leaves the sinner, when he is said to be pardoned, to suffer, as if he were condemned. He must, for all his pardon, be damned to a temporary hell, (for such is their Purgatory) and there he must be punished in the severest manner and measure, with the greatest suffering of all, *as to loss* (the want of the vision and fruition of God) and the most exquisite tortures, *as to sense*, *o* such as are equivalent to the torments of hell; and all this it may be for 100 or 1000 years, they know not how long. All the pardoning mercies of God, and the redemption of Christ, *p* cannot secure him from this. Sure this pardon looks nothing so like remission, as condemnation.

o Nam ut recte explicat Card. Cajetanus pœna illa quæ luenda restat post culpæ remissionem est illa ipsa pœna sensus, quam in Gehenna pati debuisset peccator, remota solum æternitate Idem de pœnit.

p The Pope (sure his Holiness has left him no mercy) can do it when he list; Silvest. *sum. v. Papa q. 6. si quaratur u erum possit spoliare Purgatorium pro libito suo: dico quod non voluntate sua precise sed mediante illo infinito thesauro* But he is wise however, and considers if he should spoil Purgatory, he would spoil something else, which is more regarded at *Rome* than another World.

Thirdly, what we said last, respects those sins which they call mortal; but there is with them another sort of sins which go under the notion of venials, and which in number exceed the other vastly and incomparably. And these sins by their Doctrine are not pardoned, or need no pardon; and so Justification, the free Grace of God, and the redemption of Christ, are excluded hereby, as needless, and unconcerned in them.

The pardon in Justification frees the sinner from eternal punishment; but they teach, that these sins (all of them together) deserve not eternal punishment: *q* God cannot justly inflict it for them. It is not due to them. If the guilt of all the sins in the World, of this sort, were charged upon one man; or if there were no covenant or promise of God for pardon, says their great Cardinal, (*i. e.* if there were no Gospel, no Christ) yet a sinner could not be punished for them eternally. So that there is no place for, no need of the pardon of the Gospel as to these sins. Then for the temporal punishment of them, the sinner either must, or may suffer it himself, and so satisfy for it: if he *may* satisfie for it, there's no need of pardon: if he *do* satisfie for it, there is no place for pardon. He that suffers what punishment the Law will have inflicted for his offence, neither is nor can be said to be pardoned. *r* So that plainly by their Doctrine, venial sins have not, or need not pardon of any sort, either in respect of eternal or temporal punishment.

q Nigamus -- posse Deum juste punire peccatum quodlibet etiam veniale, pœna omnium gravissima quæ est mors æterna. Bellarm. *de amiss. grat.* L. 1. c. 14. p. 92. *etiamsi omnia peccata venialia, simul colligerentur in unum, nunquam efficerent id, quod facet unum Lethale id, ibid.* C. 13. p. 91. *Etiamsi nullum esset pactum Dei nobiscum de remissione pœnæ adhuc tamen perspicuum esset, peccatum veniale ex sua natura non inducere reatum pœnæ sempiternæ id, ibid.* C. 4. p. 95.

r Non enim remittitur quod totaliter punitur, Bellarm. *de Purgat.* L. 1. c. 7. p. 1359.

And

And yet these venial sins, which need no pardon, are many of them for their quality, great and heinous; for their number, far the greatest of all. As to their quality; their Casuists (who are dictators in this business) make what sins they list to be venial. Whereas, by their common reckoning, there are seven mortal sins; even divers of these, by their handling, are shrunk into small faults. They make *s* covetousness and prodigality two, *t* ambition, *u* vain-glory, *x* gluttony and *y* drunkenness, (if it do but half bruitifie a man,) *z* the neglect of the publick worship of God, (of all worship indeed which can be truly called so,) and the *a* neglect of charity and mercy to men; (except in such cases which rarely or never fall out;) *b* also common swearing, *c* great irreverence to the Divine Majesty, *d* abhorring of divine things, yea divers sorts of *e* blasphemy *f* and perjury, *g* murder, with others of like nature to be but venial faults. They assign several waies wherein the highest impieties against God, and greatest out-rages to men, may pass under this gentle notion, and so need no pardon. This might be clearly shewed, out of the writings of the leading men amongst them, of several orders, and such as have the chief conduct of their consciences, (though the Jesuites were left out), but it requires a large discourse, and I must not here digress a little.

s Aquinas 22. q. 118 *art.* 4. *Navar. Enchir.* C. 23. n. 18. *t* Cajetan. *sum. verb. ambitio.* *u* Aquinas *ibid.* q. 132. *art.* 3. *x* Cajetan. *ibid.* v. *gula*, & v. *immunditia.* *y* *Navar. ibid.* C. 13. *n.* 2. & C. 21. *n.* 1. *z Id.* C. 24. *n* 5. Cajetan. *ibid.* *v eleemosyn.* *a* Lopez *instruct. conse.* C. 42. p. 227. & Sylvest. *sum.* v *juament.* 2. 48. *b* Jacob *de* Graff *decis. aur.* L. 2. c. 52. *n.* 10. *c* Sylvest. *ibid.* v. *malitia*, p. 170. *d Id ibid.* v. *blasphem.* q. 3. 4. *Domina soto de just.* & *jur.* L. 8. q. 2. *art.* 3 p. 269, 270. *d Id ibid.* L. 5. q. 1. *art.* 8.

And, as these sort of sins are great otherwise, so, that they are the greatest of all for number, is no question. Their Church enjoyns but confession once a year, and presumes that any wicked person may give an account, in a little while, to his Confessor, of the mortal sins he commits in a whole year: but of venial sins no account can be given, being so numerous, that they are beyond remembrance or notice. So that by their Doctrine there are very few sins, in comparison, that need pardon, and so few, that need either the free Grace of God, or the redemption that is in Jesus Christ. These corruptions are dangerous and evidently damnable; I have insisted the longer thereon, because in this point (about pardon) the Romanists are conceived to come neerer the truth and us than I fear they do indeed.

Proceed we now to the second part of the Text, (*freely by his Grace,*) When the Lord justifies a sinner, he does it most freely. It's an act of meer Grace; it's no way due to us before he vouchsafe it. He owes it not, but gives it, when he is no way pre-ingaged by any desert in us. Merit in us is utterly inconsistent with this gracious act. These two are opposite in their nature; and the Apostle plainly expresses the opposition, *Rom.* 11. 6. and 4. 4. If it be due by vertue of any act or work of ours, it is debt; if it be debt, it is not grace, the grace of God herein is no grace. *If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more*

grace;

grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, &c. Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. The Apostle's discourse cannot be answered with reason, nor evaded with any conscience. And yet the Papists will presumptuously croud merits of all sorts into Justification. And by this means too, they corrupt this Doctrine dangerously and intollerably: they do it against all evidence of Scripture; they do it to the foul defacing of the glory of *free grace*, and the *redemption of Christ*: they do it with great hazard to their own souls. For if they will not be justified freely, if they will stay till they deserve it, they are like to be condemned. Yet they will venture, and stick not to ascribe all that they include in their several justifications to some sort of merit. Inherent grace, and pardon of sin, to *congruous* merit; title to glory, and increase of Grace, (which they make a second justification) to merit of *condignity.*

Nec esset gratia, si non daretur gratuita, sed debita redderetur, Aug. *Epist.* 105.

Aquinas himself, *Manifestum est quod omne meritum repugnat gratiæ quia ut Apostolus*, Rom. 11. 1, 2. *q.* 4. *art.* 56.

Inherent (which they call justifying) grace, and count it (after the *a* Council of *Trent*) unanimously the formal cause of justification, by their Doctrine, falls under merit. They mince it indeed, calling it merit of congruity, but it is big enough, how small so-ever they would have it seem, to bid defiance to the grace of God in the Text.

a *Sess. 6. Cap. 7.*

There are some preparatory works which (they say) must go before Justification *b* as dogmatical Faith; some sorrow for sin, fear, hope, &c. to which justifying is due in congruity, though not in justice; and this duness they express in the definition of congruous merit. It is, says *Navar.* (after *Aquinas* and their common gloss) c *a good humane act, of one without the grace of God to which spiritual or temporal reward is in some respect and congruity due.* Now if justifying grace be due on our account, before the Lord vouchsafe it; he gives it not freely, but only pays what he owes, and is before obliged by us to let us have; *d* and *Bellarmine* says this merit is not founded on the promise of God, but in the worth and dignity of the work.

b *Vid. Concil.* Trident. *Sess. 6. c. 6.*

c *Est actus humanus bonus factus ab aliquo, extra gratiam Dei existente, cui de quadam congruitate, & secundum quid debetur aliqua merces spiritualis vel temporalis, ut sentit glossa. Enchirid. præcul. 7. n. 3. p. 40.*

d *Quod objiciebatur, meritum de congruo non fundari in dignitate operis sed sola promissione Dei, respondemus, contrarium esse verum*; and a little after, *Nos existimamus potius fundari meritum de congruo, in aliqua dignitate operis, quam in promissione. De Justific. L. 1 c 21. p. 753.*

This sort of merit is generally owned by the Romanists. e *Soto* tells us it is asserted by *Scotus*, *Durandus*, *Adrian*, and in a manner all the School Doctors, whom they call *Nominals*, (and this is one division of their Schools). He *f* says also, that *Aquinas* (the leader of the other

e *De natura & grat. L. 2. c. 3. p. 65. & Medina, 1 2. q. 109.*

f *Cum St.* Thomas, 2 *Sent. d.* 27, 28. *Opinionem communem insequutus affirmasset tum quod homo ex naturalibus posset se disponere ad gratiam, tum quod dispositio illa esset meritum de congruo.* Soto *ibid. p.* 66.

division)

division) following the common opinion, affirms it likewise, though he would have us think that he afterwards retracted it. But *Bellarmine* [g] not acknowledging any such retraction, together with *Aquinas*, reckons up to us, by name, the chief of the Schoolmen as of this perswasion.

[g] *Magister sententiarum, St.* Thomas, Bonaventur, Scotus, Durandus, Gabriel, and others, *de penitentia, lib. 2. c. 12. pag. 945.*

S. Clara tells us it is *certe communis et recepta sententia Scholarum Dns natura grat. Problem. 21. P. 125.*

It's true, there is some difference among them about the name: Some would not have it called *Congruous Merit*; but all, as *i Bellarmin*, *k Vega*, and after him *l Sancta Clara* tells us, agree in the thing. And it is the thing, not the word that is so injurious to the Grace of God, and wherein the corruption and the danger lies, and therein they conspire.

[i] *Quod attinet ad catholicos, quæstio videtur esse fere de solo nomine meriti, &c. de justif. l. 1. c. 21. P. 752.*

[k] *Recte advertit Vega, de re, non est inter Doctores catholicos quæst. de nomine solum est quæstio an ea debeant vocari meritum de congruo* Sancta Clara, *ibid. P. 1 29.*

I need bring no particular testimonies, to shew, that by their Doctrine, pardon of sin falls under this sort of merit: For pardon and inherent Grace are by them involved together, and made one and the same motion; and I have staid the longer on that which is evidence for both, because some question, whether this congruous merit be commonly owned by their Writers. I think it might as well be questioned, Whether the proper merit of condignity be their common doctrine; for there are some among them who dislike this, and scarce more the other, so far as I can compute the numbers.

As for the other particulars (Title to glory) included in the first, and increase of Grace, which they call a second Justification, the Council of *Trent* has made it an Article of their Faith, That good works are truly meritorious of both, and denounceth those accursed who deny it; and their Writers unanimously since understand it to be merit of condignity, as [o] *Aquinas* expresst it before. So that these things are due from God upon the account of their Good works in strict Justice, and not alone in congruity. It is not my business to argue against their Doctrine of merit, only let me suggest this which the Text leads me to.

[o] *Quum justus homo per opera sua bona quæ tanquam movente Deo facta sunt, vitam æternam de condigno mereatur, ipsum etiam gratiæ et charitatis augmentum meriti dicendum est, 1 2. q. 114. art. 86.*

Their opinion of merit makes the special Grace and mercy of God needless: For if a man by what he doth can make heaven due from God in point of Justice, he needs not his Mercy to save him, so long as he is sure the Lord will not be unjust; he is not concerned to regard whether or not he be gracious and merciful. As in a like case, when a mans cause requires nothing but Justice, if he be sure the Judg will do him Justice, there is no need at all to be beholding to him for his mercy. Thus Grace and Mercy being excluded as needless and superfluous, all obligements to love and gratitude, to all ingenuous obedience and worship, are taken off, and all sense of Religion like to be razed out of the souls of

men. I may forbear telling you that this is of dangerous tendency.

Come we to the third part of the Text, The Justification of a sinner is, *Through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ.*

That Doctrine quite overthrows the Justification of a sinner, which removes from it this redemption; but so doth the Popish Doctrine, and thereby tends to make Christ of none effect. For without that redemption, he is not, he cannot be the Saviour of any man. Their errors here strike deep, and tend to undermine the foundation of Christianity. Let me give you an account hereof in respect of the satisfaction, the merit, and the application of this redemption.

1. The satisfaction of Christ is unnecessary, by their Doctrine, there is no need of it for the justifying of a sinner; he may be pardoned and freed from eternal punishment without it. For if the pardon of sin be the abolishing, and utter extinguishing of it, as they teach, *p* and it be by infused Grace or charity, that sin is thus abolished, as dark *r* by the approach of light, and one contrary by natural consequence, at the presence of another (which is their Doctrine, if I understand it); then there was no more requisite to free a sinner from guilt and liableness to eternal punishment, but only that Christ should purchase for him habitual grace. Now to purchase this, his merit would serve, and there would be no need of satisfaction *s*. And there are those who seem to acknowledg the former, when they deny the latter.

p Bellarmine de Justif. lib. 2. c. 7. P. 783. initio. *Dicere Deum peccata remittere, non tamen prorsus tollere, hominis est vecem remissionis ignorantis. Soto de nat. et grat. lib. 2. c. 19. P. 111. Omnino idem plane vale', receata esse tecta; atque sublata esse, et nulla prorsus relicta. Petrus disput. 3. in Rom. 4. Admonemus (peccata) dimitti esse, non solum non imputari, non solum non puniri; Sed penitus etiam tolli, penitus sceleri, Maldonat. in Mat. 6.12. p. 145.* *r Quo si ut gratia gratum faciens ex diametro opponitur pecca o atque adeo formaliter per modum contrarietatis expellat ipsum ut autem est, S. Tho. 12. q. 113. art. 2. Soto ibid p. 109. Bellar. ibid. c. 2. p. 766.* *s Aliquod meritum est sine satisfactione et e contrario, id. de Purgat. lib. 1. c. 10. p. 1370.*

Then as to the temporal punishment, they leave no place at all for Christ's satisfaction; this is quite excluded here, (though this punishment be no less in their account than the torments of hell, eternity excepted): the sinner must, or may, satisfie for himself, and therefore Christ did not satisfie: otherwise the Lord would take payment twice for one debt, and require double satisfaction for every sin, and punish it *ultra demeritum*, more than it deserves, which would be cruelty: yea he would not be satisfied when he had satisfaction, which would be unreasonable. Nor is this my inference only, they do as good as acknowledge it: For they grant that Christ did not satisfie for *t* temporal pu-

t Satisfacit mediate pro pœna etiam temporali quatenus gratiam præbet per quam ipsi nos Domino satisfacimus, Bellarm. *de pœnitentia, L. 4. c. 15. p. 1076. & de Purgat. l. 1. c. 10. non quod immediate ipsa ejus satisfactio tollet pœnam temporalem nobis debitam, sed quod mediate eam tollat, quatenus videlicet, ab ea gratiam habemus, sine qua nihil valeret nostra satisfactio, p. 1369*

nishment,

niſhment, but mediately; by procuring grace for ſinners, that they might ſatiſfie for themſelves. And if he ſatiſfied no otherwiſe, he ſatiſfied not at all; no more than I can be ſaid to travel 100 miles, when I do not ſtir out of doors, becauſe I help another to a horſe, who performs ſuch a journey.

Thus, by their Doctrine of Juſtification and Pardon, the redemption of Chriſt, as to ſatisfaction made thereby, is reduced in a manner to nothing. For venial ſins, to which, they ſay, temporal puniſhment only is due; they cannot with any reaſon pretend that ſatisfaction by him is neceſſary. For mortal ſins, (a ſmall parcel of the infinite multitude of venials conſidered), habitual grace (which Chriſt might merit, though he did not ſatiſfie) is ſufficient to aboliſh fault and guilt, and ſo to procure remiſſion, as to eternal ſuffering.

Or, if habitual Grace were not ſufficient for this, yet ſtill they make the redemption of Chriſt inſufficient, and ſo no ſatisfaction. For notwithſtanding all that he hath done and ſuffered, the Lord is not appeaſed to thoſe that believe; he will puniſh, he will inflict the torment of hell, for a time at leaſt; how long, none of them can tell; but, without queſtion, (they ſay) till his juſtice be ſatisfied, till that be done by themſelves, which Chriſt alone can do, and that will be long indeed, and not end but with eternity. So that it is plain by their principles, that the Lord is not yet ſatisfied by the redemption of Chriſt? it was not as much as juſtice required, it was not enough, and ſo could not be ſatisfaction. And therefore *a Bellarmine* concludes ſuitably enough to their principles; that of the ſeveral opinions which are amongſt them concerning Chriſt's ſatisfaction and mans: this is the moſt probable, that there is no actual ſatisfaction but one only, and this is ours.

a *Tertius tamen modus videtur probabilior, quod una tantum ſit actualis ſatisfactio, & ea ſit noſtra, de Purgat. L. 1. c. 10. p. 1069.*

2. The merit of this redemption is alſo by their Doctrine made unneceſſary for the purchaſing of eternal life, to which we are accepted in Juſtification; for they teach that men may (and muſt, if they will have it) merit it for themſelves. Now there is no need of the merit of redemption, if men can, and do merit Heaven; for merit is the worth of what it is ſaid to deſerve, it muſt be (by their computation) c equal or proportionable in value to it. Now if Chriſt bring the worth of Heaven, and we muſt bring the worth of it too; the Lord lets none have Heaven till he have double the value of it, till he receive twice as much for it as it is worth: ſo that Heaven, upon this account, will be a very hard bargain, however the Lord declares it to be a gift.

c *In opere bono ex gratia procedente ſit quædam proportio & æqualitas ad præmium vitæ æternæ*, Bellarm. *de Juſtific. L. 5. c. 17. Æqualem valorem conditionatis habent*, Vaſquez.

There is no avoiding this, but either by making the merit of Chriſt needleſs, or the merits of men. The Papiſts in this caſe chooſe rather to make the merit of redemption unneceſſary. And indeed, (when they think it adviſable to ſpeak out) they ſay expreſly that there is no

need of the merit of Chriſt, that we may; thus *Vaſquez* (one of their moſt eminent writers) *d* ſeeing the merits of a juſt man (ſaith he) do condignly merit eternal life, as an equal recompence and reward; there is no need that any other condign merit, ſuch as is the merit of Chriſt, ſhould intervene that eternal life may be had. But how then muſt we underſtand them, when they tell us that Chriſt did merit eternal life for us? They inform us by their Doctrine of Satisfaction: as Chriſt ſatisfied for the temporal puniſhment due to ſin mediately, by procuring grace to ſatisfie for it our ſelves: ſo he purchaſed life for us mediately, *e* in that he was worthy to obtain grace for us, whereby we merit life our ſelves. But, by this account, he did not merit life for us at all, no more than he can be ſaid to confeſs or repent of our ſins; becauſe he obtained grace for us to confeſs and repent thereof our ſelves. This is but to own the merit of redemption, as *a Pelagius* owned the grace of God; when he ſaid it was grace, for him to form us with wills able to act ſufficiently, and perform the office of grace without it.

d Cum opera juſti mereantur vitam æternam tanquam æqualem mercedem & præmium: non opus eſt interventu alterius meriti condigni, quale eſt meritum Chriſti, ut eis reddatur vita æterna, in prima ſecundæ, q. 114. Diſput. 222. c. 3. n. 30.

e Nunquam petimus a Deo per merita Chriſti ut noſtris dignis operibus & meritoriis reddatur merces æternæ vitæ: ſed ut per Chriſtum detur nobis gratia, qua poſſemus digne hanc mercedem promereri, id. ibid. They uſe this illuſtration; A Farm being given to a ſon, he may by the commodities reaped out of that Farm, buy any thing that it ſhall pleaſe his Father to ſet to ſale. D. Biſhop in Abbot of merits. P. 640.

a They ſaid (as *Auguſtine* repreſents them) *Poſſe ſufficere naturam humanam quæ condita eſt cum libero arbitrio: eamque eſſe Dei gratiam, quia ſic conditi ſumus, ut hoc voluntate poſſimus. De geſtis contr.* Pelag. *c.* 35. And *Jerom, ad Cteſiphontem, p.* 253. *Ita Dei gratiam ponunt, ut non per ſingula opera, ejus nitamur & regamur auxilio, ſed ad liberum referent arbitrium, ut in eo Deo referendæ ſint gratiæ, quod talis nos condiderit, qui noſtro arbitrio poſſimus & eligere bona, & vitare mala: & non intelligunt iſta dicentes, quod per os eorum intollerabilem blaſphemiam Diabolus ſibilet.*

Beſides, ſecondly, their principles do not allow them to ſay, that we have inherent grace by the merit of Chriſt. And that being with them the formal cauſe of Juſtification; if it was not procured for us by his redemption, this is quite excluded from being intereſſed in juſtifying us. And indeed all the intereſt of Chriſt's redemption in our juſtification (and ſalvation too) is reduced by them to this one point, *his purchaſing inherent grace for us*, (as appears by the premiſes). So that if this be diſclaimed, there will be nothing aſcribed to Chriſt.

Now it cannot be expected, that while they profeſs themſelves Chriſtians, they ſhould, in plain terms, make Chriſt a Cipher; but they do it by conſequence too plainly. Their other principles render Chriſt's meriting inherent grace for us, to be needleſs: and ſure he would not do and ſuffer ſo much for a needleſs thing. By their Doctrine of congruous merit, a man deſtitute of inherent, (or (as they call it) juſtifying) grace, may do that which will make it due to him from God. Now that which a man can make due to himſelf, needs not at all the merit of

of Christ to make it due. The Lord will certainly let him have his due, without the mediation of any other merit.

Yea, if we should bate the word merit & *debitum*, or duness too, (as *Soto* would have it); yet if a man can do that upon which justifying grace will necessarily and infallibly follow, there is no need that Christ should purchase it; for it is altogether unnecessary that Christ should merit that for us, which we can make sure to our selves, so as to have it necessarily and infallibly. Now that a man can do thus much, to make such grace sure to him, the Dominicans (the best friends that the grace of God can find amongst the Romanists) do affirm; *Dominicus a Soto* (a principal, and the leading man amongst them) asserts it, and that upon the express testimony of *Aquinas* (whose conduct they are wont in their divinity to follow as Angelical) *b out of necessity, not that of constraint, but that of infallibility; Grace is given to him that prepares himself for it, by some help of God.* They hold, that when a man doth his endeavour, God will not deny him grace, (there's their *c* congruous merit) and think they salve all, by saying, this endeavour must be from divine assistance; but *Pelagius* acknowledged, that no less than they and *Augustine*, with other his opposers, take notice of it: yet because he would have grace to be given according to merits, (though by merits was understood, not that which deserved it, but any thing done by a sinner, in respect of which grace is given, as *d Bellarmine* confesseth); they condemned him, as evacuating the redemption of Christ, and the grace of God.

b *Quod ex necessitate non quidem coactionis, sed tamen infallibilitatis detur gratia, se, per auxilium Dei præparanti, de nat. & grat. l.* 3. *c.* 13. *p.* 165. And this divine assistance, others of them say, a graceless person may merit, *Prosclo longe probabilius dicetur, per opera bona moralia, quibus aliquis ante acceptam gratiam faceret quod moraliter potest, eatenus primam gratiam ex congruo illam mereri, quatenus conveniens, & congruum est, ut cum talis facit, quantum in illo statu moraliter potest, Deus etiam præstat id quod suarum est partium, hoc est ei homini auxilia actualia augeat, quibus adjutus possit facilius gratiam consequi, atque adeo consequatur si sibi non desit.* Gregor. *de valent. l. de grat. devin. pars* 4. *c. ult.*

c *Peccator per bona opera facta extra charitatem meretur de congruo primam gratiam, ibi est enim quædam congruitas, quia facit quod in se est,* Bonavent. 2. *Dist.* 27. *n.* 39.

d *De gratia & lib. arbitrio, l.* 6. *c.* 5. *p.* 659. *Gratiam autem secundum merita nostra dari intelligunt patres cum aliquid fit proprius viribus, ratione cujus detur gratia, etiamsi non sit illum meritum de condigno.*

In fine, if a man by their principles could not merit justifying grace for himself: yet still, by their Doctrine, there would be no need of Christ's merits: For they teach that any other just man *e* may merit it for him *de congruo*, and do so much on his behalf, Aquinas, *prima secundæ q.* 114. *art.* Bellarmine will have this past all doubt, *Sicut certum est, non posse unum alteri ex condigno gratiam prometeri, ita non dubium est, posse id ex congruo fieri. De Justificat. l.* 5. *c.* 21. *p.* 969. Bonaventure will have this to be *meritum digni,* 1 *Dist.* 40. *n.* 8. *Est dignitas cum indignitate sicut cum vir justus meretur peccatori primam gratiam dignitas enim est ex parte viri justi,* 2 *Dist.* 27. *n.* 39.

e *Merito congrui potest aliquis alteri mereri primam gratiam,*

as it would be indecent and incongruous to the bounty of God, to deny him grace. And this is enough to make him sure of it infallibly; seeing the Lord is as far from acting undecently or incongruously, as he is from dealing unjustly.

I need not tell you these errors are dangerous; unless you need be told that there is danger in making Christ signifie little or nothing in the justifying of sinners.

The last thing propounded is the application of this Redemption, *i.e.* of the bloud of Christ, or his obedience or his righteousness, (for those are used by the Apostle, as terms of the same import). If we be accepted as righteous, it must be upon the account of some righteousness; we have none of our own that can acquit us before the Lord's tribunal. That of ours will neither satisfie for what is past, nor serve us for the future; it cannot of it self be a good title to life, which has in it just ground for condemnation. The righteousness of Christ is alsufficient for all the exigences of our condition. But that it may be our Justification, (*Rom.* 5. 18.) it must be our Righteousness: and how can that be? We need no other man to tell us, than *Bellarmine* himself; *a The sin of* Adam (says he) *is communicated in such a manner, as that which is past, can be communicated*; that is by imputation. If the Cardinal had not been a meer servant to his *hypothesis*, he would have followed this so far as the reason of it leads him; and then it would have brought him to acknowledg no less of the righteousness of the second *Adam* than of the sin of the first: both are past, and no other way to communicate what is past, but by imputation.

a *Nobis vero communicatur per generationem, eo modo, quo communicari potest id quod transiit, nimirum per imputationem. De amiss. grat. L. 5. c. 17. p. 332.*

This imputation is it which they will deny, and yet cannot but confess. And in their great Champion, we may see manifestly the evidence of truth strugling with the power of interest and prejudice; and prevailing so far as to force from him three or four acknowledgments of this imputation, in that *b* dispute, where he sets himself with all his might to oppose it.

b *De justific. l. 2. c. 17. p. 785. Ss. quarto refellitur, & c. 10. p. 793. Et hoc modo non esset absurdum, si quis nobis diceret, nobis imputari Christi justitiam & merita, cum nobis donentur & applicentur, ac si nos ipsi Deo satisfeciss emus, & p. 794. Ss. respondeo & Sl. hac igitur falsa, &c.*

There are these severals considerable, about the imputing this righteousness: first Substitution; Christ satisfied in our stead, *i. e.* He tendred that which was due from us. Secondly, Acceptance; the Father accepted what Christ performed in our stead, as performed on our behalf. Thirdly, Participation; we have the fruits and advantages of his undertaking, no less than if we our selves had satisfied. Now, the first of these the Romanists assert, the third they acknowledg, and the second they cannot deny, unless they will deny that the Father accepted Christ's perfect performance, on the behalf of those for whom he undertook it by his own appointment. And as this performance, so stated, is that we mean, by Christ's righteousness: so this acceptance, as declared in the Gospel, in reference to those that believe, includes all that we mean by imputation. Nor need we contend for more, than they cannot, without something like blasphemy, deny, *viz.* God's acceptance of Christ's satisfaction.

Then

Then doth God impute the righteousnes of Christ to a believer, when he accepts what Christ performed for him, as if he had performed it. As we say, then a Creditor imputes the payment of the debt to the debtor, when he accepts of what the surety pays for him, as if himself had paid it. There is ground enough in Scripture to use this for illustration at least. *Heb.* 7. 22. *Matth.* 6. 12.

And by the light hereof, *a* a mean capacity may see a clear answer to the greatest objections made by the Papists against Christ's righteousnes imputed, 1. *Obj.* If Christ's righteousnes be truly imputed unto us, then we might be called, and accounted redeemers of the World. *Ans.* He might as reasonably say, the debtor may be called and accounted the surety, because the surety's payment is accepted for him, 2. *Obj.* If Christ's righteousnes be imputed to us as if it were ours, then we ought to be accounted as righteous as Christ. *Answ.* He might as well argue, the debtor is as rich as the surety, because the surety pays his debt, 3. *Obj.* If by the righteousnes of Christ imputed to us, we may be said to be truly righteous; then Christ, by our unrighteousnes imputed to him, may be truly called a sinner. *Answ.* Which is just as if he should say; If the acceptance of the surety's payment acquit the debtor; then the surety, because the debt is charged on him, (though he contracted it not) is as bad a husband, and as much a bankrupt as the debtor.

a Without lessening the difference betwixt debts and punishments; a surety as to either will serve our purpose. *Answ.*

I need bring no particular arguments for this. All the Scriptures, where there is mention of Christ's dying for us, his sufferings, cleansing us with his bloud, his obedience to death, *&c.* (since it cannot be denied but all this was well pleasing to God, and accepted by him, as it was performed on the behalf of believers) are undeniable proofs, that his righteousnes is imputed.

And it is a wonder to me, that any who acknowledg the satisfaction of Christ, should have the confidence to say, there is no evidence for this imputation, in the sense expressed; but their causeless prejudice against the word, makes them it seems so sullen, that they will not take notice of the things we mean, though they meet with it every where in Scripture.

In short, (I fear I have transgressed already, and must omit much of what I intended); if Christ's righteousnes be not imputed, it is not accepted; if it be not accepted, it is not performed, and so there will be no satisfaction, no redemption in Jesus Christ. This is *Bellarmine*'s own inference when he is disputing against *Osiander*; to deny God's accepting Christ's righteousnes for us, (which is by the premisses his imputing it to us) is to overthrow the whole mystery of mans redemption and reconciliation.

De Justific. l. 2. c. 2. c. 5. p. 778. from his opinion, says he, *Certe sequitur, ut Christi justitiam Deus non acceptet*, which cannot be admitted, *nisi quis velit totum mysterium humanæ redemptionis & reconciliationis everterc.*

Use. For Application. Let me admonish you, as you tender the honour of Christ, and the comfort and happiness of your souls; to receive and preserve the Doctrine of Justification pure and untainted, as the Apostle delivered it. Beware especially of the Popish corruptions, whereby they

they have adulterated, and wherewith they have overwhelmed it. Whereas it is, as delivered in Scripture, the foundation of our hopes, and the spring of our comforts: they have made it a sink, into which a great part of their other corruptions do run, and settle; or the source from which they rise, and are fed. I might make this good by an account of particulars: but those I have touched already are too many. They tell you, to be justified, is to be sanctified, and so sanctified, as to need no further sanctification after the first infusion: no growth in grace, no increase of holiness, no progress therein, nor mortification neither, no need of, no reason for it. Their principles are so indulgent, as to free you from such trouble. But then you must not take notice of the many commands of God which enjoyn these, and make them necessary; nor of the hazard that attends such neglects. They will assure you there is none under the notion which they represent them.

They tell you, you must be justified by your own righteousness, and that a perfect righteousness within you; that's it you must trust to; and if you think much to be justified, as never any sinner in the world was; and know not how to compass a righteousness absolutely perfect within you: they will inform you, that any degree of charity, the least, the weakest, is righteousness in perfection. Thus you may be justified in their way, if you will but have patience till your inherent righteousness in this world be perfect and spotless; or till the lowest degree of it be absolute perfection. If you think it impossible to be justified upon such terms; they will tell you there is nothing more easy. Any of their Sacraments will help you to it; for they all confer justifying grace, and that by the meer external act. You may have it, though you never mind what you are a doing, when you are at Sacrament, to get it. An easie way to Heaven indeed, if it were as easie to be saved, as deluded.

They will have you believe that their Doctrine of Justification is that which we must approve, since it includes pardon; and yet they have no pardon by their Doctrine, while there is one speck of sin in their souls: and so not in this world, and the other is no world for it. And though they fancy, that fault, and stain, and desert, and the very being of sin, is abolished when they have pardon; and will have none, that is not lawful: yet are they not pardoned for all that; but plainly condemned, and into infernal fires they must go, and be there tortured, (after they are so fully pardoned) till themselves have fully satisfied, and paid the utmost farthing. And if they cannot do that, which Christ only can do, *viz.* satisfie the justice of God for all sorts of sins, as to part of the punishment due to some, and the whole punishment due to others. Their Purgatory will prove Hell, everlastingness not abated: and they will find themselves damned eternally, and cast into Hell, who, *by* their Doctrine, were betrayed into that state, under a pretence of being

ing punished there a while, in order to Salvation. And if the demerit of sins, which they call venial, prove greater, than they believe (without and against Scripture) they are in Hell, while they dream they are but in Purgatory; for the partition between Hell and Purgatory, is but the distinction made in their fansies, betwixt mortal and venial sins, as to their demerit.

Thus are they in danger to be pardoned, and no wonder, since there is not one sin in five hundred, which, by their Doctrine, needs Christ or his blood for its pardon; there's no need of the blood of sprinkling for the infinite numbers of their venials. They have a sprinkling of their own will serve, an holy water conjured into such divine powers, as to wash away a world of sins, fault and punishment both. This is the fountain (one of them) which themselves have opened for sin and uncleanness; and the other opened by Christ may be shut up, unless there may be some use of it for another sort of sins, but those very few, in comparison.

Remissio Venialium qui est effectus aquæ benedictæ sine collatione gratiæ & sanctitatis confertur. Non pœnas culparum modo, sed id quod mihi probabilius est, culpas quoq; veniales remittet. Melchior Canus. *De Sacr. pars* 1. *p.* 751.

Indeed, it is the intollerable injury they offer to Christ, his redemption, and the free grace of God, which makes their Doctrine of Justification most intollerable. To strip the redemption which is in Jesus Christ, of its merit or satisfaction, without which it is no redemption: to make the mercy of God needless, or the free exercise of it impossible, and his grace to be no grace; is the way not to be justified, but condemned. This is to seek pardon of former offences, by new crimes, as if one would not receive a pardon without interlining it with something of treasonable import against him who offers it. Yea, it seems an attempt to blot out of the pardon all that is pardoning; and to affront and deface that upon which all the hopes of a condemned sinner depends, and without which no flesh can be justified. When ever the Lord justifies any, he doth it *freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ:* they that will not be thus justified, are in danger o be condemned.

SERMON XIII.

God not to be Worshipped as represented by an Image.

'Tis not lawful to give Religious Worship to any Creature whatsoever.

'Tis not lawful to make an Image of God.

'Tis not lawful to Worship God, as represented by an Image, or to direct our Worship of him to an Image.

'Tis not lawful to Worship Images, by doing it corporally, as Idolaters do, though we pretend to keep our hearts to God.

The Papists presumptuously leave the second Commandment out of the Decalogue.

Mat. 4. 10. *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

THE eleven first Verses of this Chapter, contain the History of the Combat, or Conflict between Christ and Satan; and in *it* you may take notice of these Particulars.

1. You have the preparation to the *Combat*, v. 1,2. *Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil; and when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungred.* *Then*, that is, immediately after Christ had been baptized in an extraordinary manner, and solemnly declared by a voice from Heaven, that he was *the beloved Son of God, in whom he was well pleased*; and after *the Heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove, and lighting upon him*, and was *full of the Holy Ghost*, as St. *Luke* records it, *Luke* 4. 1. *Then* (that that is imme-

immediately after this) *he was led up of the Spirit into the wilderneſs to be tempted of the Devil.* We ſhould have thought that the next news might have been of his taking a ſolemn Journey to *Jeruſalem*, and in the Temple there publickly to have declared, that he was the great Doctor and Prophet of his *Church*, and that they were accordingly to hear him: but God's thoughts are not as our thoughts; the Text tells you, *then*, that is, immediately upon this, *he was led by the Spirit into the wilderneſs to be tempted of the Devil.*

2. You have the Combat or Conflict it ſelf, from the third Verſe to the eleventh: the Devil takes an occaſion hereupon to ſet upon him, and to aſſault him with theſe dreadful temptations. The firſt temptation, or aſſault, you have Verſ. 3. *If thou be the Son of God, command that theſe ſtones be made bread:* As if he had ſaid, There was a Voice preſently from Heaven, that thou art Gods beloved Son, in whom he is well pleaſed; but if ſo, is it likely that God ſhould take no further care of his own Son whom he loved, than to expoſe him to the want even of neceſſaries for the preſent life? ſo that, either thou art not the Son of God, and that pretended Voice from Heaven is but a deluſion, or if thou beeſt ſo, let it appear by making of this Miracle, *Command that theſe ſtones be made bread.* The reply or anſwer made by our Saviour to this temptation, you have Verſ. 4. *But he anſwered and ſaid, It is written, Man ſhall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God:* where our Saviour ſhews, that this was a notorious Impoſture, and a fallacious way of reaſoning, that either he muſt periſh in the wilderneſs with famine, or elſe he muſt prove himſelf to be the Son of God by working a Miracle, and commanding ſtones to be made bread: for, *It is written, Man ſhall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.* This temptation not taking effect, and the Devil foiled and non-pluſt by the force and dint of the Scripture, he makes a ſecond aſſault upon him, Verſ. 5, 6. *Then the Devil taketh him up into the holy City, and ſetteth him on a Pinacle of the Temple, and ſaith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, caſt thy ſelf down, for it is written, He ſhall give his Angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they ſhall bear thee up, leſt at any time thou daſh thy foot againſt a ſtone.* I know that St. *Luke* obſerves not the ſame order in the recording of theſe temptations, as St. *Matthew* doth, but it is likely that was the third and laſt temptation, when Satan had that rebuke given him by our Saviour, *Get thee hence, Satan*, for immediately upon this, Verſ. 11. *the Devil leaveth him, and Angels came and miniſtred unto him*; and therefore I call this the ſecond aſſault or temptation. The third and the laſt temptation, or aſſault, which ſeems to be moſt dangerous, you have Verſ. 8, 9. *Again, the Devil taketh him up into an exceeding high Mountain, and ſheweth him all the Kingdoms of the World, and the Glory of them, and ſaith unto him, All theſe things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worſhip me.* In St. *Luke*,

Chap. 4. 6. he pretends a reason for it, *And the Devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the Glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it.* And Vers. 7. *If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine.* But the Devil was a Lyar from the beginning, and there were three notorious Lyes in this pretence of the Devils: 1. *All this power will I give thee, and the Glory of them*; whereas he had no such Power or Glory to bestow. 2. The second was, *For that is delivered unto me:* but God never made the Devil the Heir of all things, but his own Son. *Heb.* 1. 2. *He hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things.* 3. The third was, *To whomsoever I will, I give it:* as if Satan could give the Kingdoms of the World to whom he pleased, a power which God hath reserved for himself, and hath not conferred on any Creature whatsoever. *Daniel* 2. 20, 21. *Blessed be the Name of God for ever and ever, for Wisdom and Might are his, he changeth the times and the seasons, he removeth Kings, and setteth up Kings.* We read that Satan is sometimes transformed into an Angel of Light, 2 *Cor.* 6. 14. but here he would be transformed into God himself; as also in that which follows, namely, that he would be adored and worshipped; *If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine:* or, as you have it in the Text, *All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.* Now in these words you have the reply or answer that our Saviour makes to this temptation; *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*: where you have two things considerable: 1. You have something premised, or something prefatory unto Christ's answer, *Get thee hence, Satan*; which may be understood two ways: 1. Either as *Vox detestantis*, a Note of abhorrence and detestation, of the Devils horrible impudence and blasphemy, in that he would have Christ to fall down and worship him: or, 2. As *Vox imperantis*, a word of power and authority, commanding him out of his presence, *Get thee hence, Satan*, and thereby sufficiently declaring himself to be the Son of God, which was the thing in question: the Devil had twice put an *if* upon his Sonship, Vers. 3. *If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread:* And Vers. 6. *If thou be the Son of God, cast thy self down*: Now our Saviour will have this to be out of question, and therefore commands him to be gone, *Get thee hence, Satan*; and the next news is, Vers. 11. *Then the Devil leaveth him, and behold, Angels came and ministred unto him.* 2. You have the answer it self, *For it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Where again you have two things to be taken into Consideration: 1. You have our Saviours urging Scripture in the case, *It is written:* The Word of God is armour of proof against Satan and his temptations, and hence the Apostle makes it one main part of the Christian armour, *Ephes.* 6. 17. *Take the Helmet of Salvation, and the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word*

Word of God; and our Saviour makes use of this Sword in the Text, *It is written*, but where, see *Deut.* 6. 13. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him*; and Deut. 10. 20. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave*: where I would note, that our Saviour doth not quote the very words that are in *Deuteronomy*, it is said there, *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him*, our Saviour says, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*: and yet notwithstanding, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*. And I would the rather take notice of this, because there are a generation of men amongst us, that tell us, upon occasion, that we do not speak Scripture-Language, and their reason is, because we do not speak Scripture-words: But, Friends, take this for a principle, If we speak Scripture-sence, though not the very words of Scripture, yet we may be said to speak Scripture-Language: Thus our Saviour here speaking Scripture-sence, speaks Scripture-Language, *It is written*. Fear is a word of great latitude and extent, and comprehends in its self that homage, and honour, and reverence, that we owe to God; and therefore our Saviour calls it Worship, and says, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, &c.* Thus it is also in the like case, if the word person be Scripture-sence, it is Scripture-Language: if the word Sacrament be Scripture-sence, it is Scripture-Language. 2. You have the Scripture that is urged in these words, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*. Satan would have our Saviour to *fall down and worship him*: our Saviour replies, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*: and the meaning and import of it is this, that which is proper and peculiar unto God, ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever: but Worship is so, and therefore ought not to be given to any Creature whatsoever. Satan is a Creature, and if there were no more in the case than that, even that is reason sufficient why he ought not to be Worshipped: *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*. Thus I have given you an account both of the preparation to the Combat or Conflict between Christ and Satan, as also of the Combat or Conflict it self; thirdly, you have the issue of the whole transaction between Christ and Satan, Vers. 11. *Then the Devil leaveth him, and behold Angels came and ministred unto him*.

My Text contains the answer, or the repulse that was given by our Saviour unto Satans third and last assault; *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*.

The Proposition that I would commend unto your Consideration from the words, is this, That *Religious Worship ought not to be given to any Creature whatsoever*: or thus; *God alone is, and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship*. I say, God alone is, and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship: Honour and Worship is Gods due and right, *Prop.*

and

and irreligion is a piece of wrong and injustice; and indeed, if divine honour was not given to God as his due and right, worship will be a part of benevolence from the creature unto God.

1. In the prosecution of this point, I shall, by God's assistance, observe this method. 1. I shall give you a brief description of worship, and shew you what worship is.

2. I shall lay down some distinctions for the due stating, and the right understanding of this proposition.

3. I shall endeavour to prove the proposition, namely, that *religious worship ought not to be given to any creatures whatsoever*; or that *God alone is, and ought to be the object of religious worship.*

4. And the fourth particular shall be the Use and Application.

1. For the first of these, I shall endeavour to dispatch in a few words; namely, to give you a brief description of worship, and shew you what worship is.

Worship is that honour or reverence that we give unto a person, or being, regard being had to the dignity and excellency of that person or being that is to be worshipped; and it consists of three Acts.

1. An act of the mind, whereby we rightly conceive of the dignity and excellency of that person or being that we worship.

2. An act of the will, whereby, upon occasion, we are ready and willing to pay all offices of respect to that person or being.

3. An act of the body, whereby we express that respect or honour that is in our minds, unto that person or being, by some outward one of bodily act, as prostration, uncovering of the head, bowing the knee, or the like; and this is all I shall say to the first particular, what worship is.

2. Our next work is, to lay down some distinctions for the due stating and right understanding of this propolition; namely, *that religious worship ought not to be given to any creature whatsoever*; or that *God alone is and ought to be the object of religious worship*: as,

1. We must distinguish between our works, and religious worship: now, although religious worship ought to be given to God alone, yet civil worship may, and ought to be given unto creatures: this is a duty from Inferiors to their Superiors, from Children to their Parents, from Servants to their Masters, from subjects to Kings and Magistrates; these Gods must have civil worship: thus it is said of *Judah*, when *Jacob* on his death-bed blessed the twelve tribes, *Gen.* 49. 8. Judah, *thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy Father's children shall bow down before thee.* *Judah*'s honour was to weild the Scepter; and therefore the rest of the Tribes his Father's children, in a civil sense, were to worship him, and bow down before him: thus, when *Joseph* came into the presence of *Jacob* his Father, it is said, 48. 12. That *he bowed himself with his face to the earth*; this was civil worship.

And

And indeed, this worship considered apart, and in a separate way, seems to be proper unto the creature, and so not fit to be given unto God. If any should say, but is not God to receive all honour, and glory, and worship; and if so, why should civil worship be excluded? I answer, because this is not the way to honour God: if we should worship God no otherwise than as we worship a creature, this would be to blaspheme him, under a pretence of giving him that honour that we owe him. We may observe even amongst the creatures, that the homage or honour that we give unto the creature, hath alwaies respect unto the greatest excellency of that creature; as suppose a *King* were present, a *Duke*, or a *Marquess*, or an *Earl*; if a man should give him only that respect that is due unto a *Duke*, or a *Marquess*, or an *Earl*, this were in effect to degrade him of his *Kingly* power: if we give only the honour unto God, that a Creature may challenge as his due, this strikes at the very God-head it self, and we do, what lies in us, to degrade him of his supremacy and transparent glory.

2. We must distinguish between inward worship, and outward worship: there is inward worship in Faith, and Love, and Hope, and Fear, and other elicit acts of the mind; this is the inward homage that we owe unto God: and then there is outward worship, which consists in the outward expression of that inward homage and subjection that we owe to God, which is done as you heard before, by some outward one of bodily act, as prostrating, uncovering of the head, bowing of the knee, and the like. Now, though the worship of God consists mainly and principally in the former; for there may be a pretence of outward homage and reverence, and yet nothing of worship; as the Souldiers bowed the knee to Christ, and yet mocked him, *Matth.* 27. 29. yet outward worship is necessary; inward and outward worship doth mutually depend upon each other: he that doth not pray, nor read, nor hear, nor receive Sacraments, doth neither love God, nor fear him, nor trust in him. And besides, outward worship is a most effectual help and assistance unto the principle of inward worship, strengthening the habit of it, and exciting of it unto all suitable actions: for though *bodily exercise*, as it is single, and divided from the heart, doth, as the Apostle saith, *profit little*: yet when it joyns with it, it profits much, and makes us far more lively in the service of God, than otherwise we should be: and we may find by experience, that when we pray only inwardly in our spirits, we have not that life and enlargement in our minds and affections, as when we also pray outwardly with the voice; and upon these and such like grounds, it is advised by some, that prayer, though secret, should be vocal, because it excites affection, and quickens devotion: thus, though inward worship be the main of worship, and that which may most properly be called worship; yet outward worship is necessary: the second Commandment hath a special respect unto outward worship, namely, that we perform unto God that outward worship which he hath

appointed

appointed in his Word. And that which the Devil would have of our Saviour here, is outward Worship, *All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me.* If any shall pretend that it is External Veneration that they give unto other things besides God, whereas that which is inward, and which may most properly be called Worship, they reserve for God: the vanity of such a pretence will appear, if we consider, that it is not a necessary requisite unto false and idolatrous Worship, that the inward devotion of the mind should accompany the external adoration of the body: for if so, it will follow, that a man being commanded under a severe penalty, might give outward adoration to any Image, either of the true or false gods, and yet be guiltless; and who durst ever say so?

3. We will take it for granted, that Religious Worship admits of degrees, namely, that there is Religious Worship in an higher degree, and Religious Worship in a lower and inferiour degree: for, I suppose, that the Veneration and Adoration that our Adversaries of the Church of *Rome* give unto Images and Reliques, and things of that nature, is not Civil, but Religious, though in a lower and an inferiour degree. Now this being taken for granted, I affirm, That God, and God alone, is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship, in the latitude of it; and that Religious Worship in the lowest and most inferiour degree, ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever, and that will appear from these following Considerations.

1. It appears from the words of the Text, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Now if we are to Worship God alone, and serve God alone, then *God, and God alone is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship; and Religious Worship ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever.* If it be Objected, That the Text doth not say, Thou shalt *worship* the Lord thy God only, but him only shalt thou *serve:* that there is indeed an honour and a service that is due unto God alone, which to give unto any Creature would be Idolatry. Him only shalt thou *serve:* but there is a *Worship* which is due unto the Creatures according to their respective Excellencies, as to Saints, holy things, and holy places, and we may worship them, though we may not serve them: but if this were the sense of this Scripture, the Devil might have excepted against the answer made by our Saviour as insufficient: he might have said, Thou mayst *worship* me, though thou mayst not *serve* me: and that this Scripture did not forbid all Worship, yea that some Religious Worship might be given to a Creature in a lower and inferiour degree, though the Supreme Worship might not; and all that he desired of our Saviour was, *That he would fall down and worship him:* that it was inferiour *Worship*, though *Religious*, which the Devil required of Christ, is plain, for he acknowledges God at the same time to be his Superiour, and the Giver of that power which he laid claim to, *Luk.* 4. 6. *And the Devil said unto him, All this power will*

will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and unto whomsoever I will I give it: And yet that is the *Worship* which Christ saith God hath forbidden to be given unto any Creature; and our Saviour discovers his abhorrence and detestation of any thing of that nature, *Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Nor was it the scope of our Saviour to give countenance to any such distinction as this, as appears from that place of Scripture which is here quoted, *Deut.* 6. 13. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his Name.* Vers. 14. *Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you.* Where *Moses* doth not distinguish between the *Worship* that is due to *God*, and that *Worship* which may be given unto the Creature; but describes the *Worship* which ought to be given unto *God*, and to *God* alone, and which ought not to be given unto the gods of the Gentiles: and besides this ought to be taken into Consideration, we do not find the word *only* in *Deuteronomy* annexed either to the *fear* of God, or to the *service* of God. Now would it have been fairly and ingeniously done by any that lived under the Old Testament Dispensation, to make this gloss upon the Text? It is true, we must fear the Lord our God, but not him only; and serve him, but not serve him only: so that our Saviour add the word *only* for Explication sake; and indeed if God be to be worshipped at all, and served at all, for the same reason he *only* is to be worshipped, and he *only* is to be served: so that our Saviour doth not only recite this Text in *Deuteronomy*, but he doth it with advantage, when he tells Satan, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Worship* is called *Religious*, because it binds us to God, and to God alone: and whereever in Scripture it is said we must worship God, we must always understand it thus, we must worship him alone. Thus the Angel in the *Revelations*, Chap. 19. 10. where he tells *John*, that he must *Worship God*; the meaning is, that he must *Worship God alone.* Psal. 29. 2. *Give unto the Lord the glory due to his Name*; and then it follows by way of explication, *Worship the Lord in the beauty of Holiness.* 'Tis said of *Job*, Chap. 1. Vers. 20. *That he arose, and rent his Mantle, and fell down upon the ground and worshipped:* Nothing is said of the *Object* unto whom he did direct his *Worship*; the *Object* of his *Worship* is not expressed, but understood, and presupposed; if he fell down and *Worshipped* in a religious manner, it is to be taken for granted that he *Worshipped God.*

2. It appears yet further, that *God, and God alone is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship*, and that *Religious Worship ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever*, because God hath expressly forbidden us in Scripture the Worshipping of Angels, *Col.* 2. 18. *Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and Worshipping of Angels.* The Apostles scope in this Chapter is to dispute against

those Corruptions that were creeping into the Christian Worship, these sometimes he calls the *traditions of men, the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ*, Vers. 8. and the *commandments and doctrines of men*, *Vers.* 22. And amongst other Corruptions, he cautions them against Worshipping of Angels. Now if Religious Worship might be given to a Creature, then to these glorious Creatures; but this, according to the Apostles sense, is superstition, and will-worship. So Vers. 23. *Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will-worship*, how the Church of *Rome* owns and avouches the *Worshipping of Angels*, which the Apostle forbids. 'Tis true indeed, the Papists, in their Worshipping of Saints and Angels, give the Saints the pre-eminence: 'Tis by their means, say they, that Indulgences are given out of the Churches Treasury, or rather put to sale; they having not only merited their own Salvation, but some of them at least supererogated for the good of others, in that they have done more and greater things than are enjoined in Gods Word: And this is an honour, that, according to their Principles, is not, nor ought to be given to the blessed Angels.

But how extravagant soever the fancies of these men are, or may be, yet I shall aver, That if *Religious Worship* might be given to any Creature, then unto these Glorious Creatures, and that not only because they never sinned against God, as the Saints have done, but also because unto their care and tutelage are committed God's holy ones, and they are *sent forth to minister for them that are heirs of salvation*, Heb. 1. 14. But we read not of any such employ assigned by God unto the Saints departed.

If any should say the *Worship* of *Angels* forbidden in the Scripture, is the *Supreme Worship* that is proper unto *God* alone, and to give this indeed unto the *Angels*, would be Superstition and Will-worship, but not *Religious Worship* in an inferiour degree: What an horrible bold perverting of Scripture is this? and who can reasonably imagine, that the Apostle *Paul*, when he knew that the Worshipping of Angels was not only good and lawful, but highly commendable, should yet in the general condemn the *Worshipping of Angels* without any distinction at all made in the case.

And whereas it may be said, that St. *Paul* doth not in the general condemn the *Worshipping of Angels*, but the Worshipping of Angels as *Mediators*, so as to exclude *Christ*: for the Apostle adds, Vers. 19. *And not holding the Head.* It is true, the Apostle doth so: but then we must know, that *Religious Worship*, though in an inferiour degree given to an *Angel*, is inconsistent *with holding the Head, Christ.* As a Wife that gives the honour of her Husbands Bed unto another, (and all religious and divine respect is no less) denies him to be what she calls him, though she call him Husband never so much. The reason urged in the second Commandment against false Worship, is, that *God is a jealous God:* now we must understand it thus; he is *jealous*, not only less

lest he should not be honoured as God, but he is also *jealous* lest he should not be honoured as one God: for as by the *Worshipping* of him we acknowledge him to be God, so by the *incommunicableness* of that *Worship* to any Creature, we acknowledge him to be one *God*.

And yet that there may be no mistake in this matter, we deny not, but that good men, when Angels have appeared unto them in a visible shape, even when they have known that they have been *Angels*, have given honour to them, and it may be bowed down before them: but then it is granted on all hands, that the same external gesture may be adapted and fitted to the *Worship* that is *Civil*, and that which is *Religious*: and it lies upon our Adversaries to prove, that the honour or *Worship* given unto them was *Religious*, and of the very same kind that we give unto God, but in an inferiour and lower degree. We read of *Abraham*, Gen. 18. 2. *that he lift up his eyes, and lo, three men stood by him; and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the Tent-door, and bowed himself toward the ground*: but that this was a Civil, not a Religious respect, appears by the entertainment that he offers to make for them, Vers. 4. 5. *Let a little water I pray you be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest your selves under the tree, and I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts*: Indeed afterwards he knew one of them to be the Angel of the Covenant, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is called *Jehovah* in that Chapter, and might *Worship* him with *Religious Worship*. But this doth not in the least contradict our Principles, nor the Text, for God must and ought to be *Worshipped*, though we must *Worship the Lord our God, and him only must we serve*: Unto which I might add, that the Servants of God under the Law, had a fair occasion offered them to invoke and *Worship Angels*, which we have not under the Gospel, because they frequently then appeared unto them in the likeness of men, which they do not to us; and yet we never read that the people of God under the Legal Dispensation, did invoke them, or pay any religious respect to them. *David saw the Angel that smote the people*, 2 *Sam.* 24. 17. yet did he not in the least apply himself to the *Angel*, or *Worship* him, but made his address unto God; *David spake unto the Lord, when he saw the Angel that smote the people, and said, Lo I have sinned, but these sheep, what have they done?*

3. It appears yet further, that *God alone is, and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship*, and *that Religious Worship ought not to be given to any Creature whatsoever*, because Religious Worship, though in the *lowest and most inferiour degree*, is such that neither *Saints* nor *Angels* durst own or receive: We read how that the Devil would be Worshipped, but Saints and good Angels would not; and I shall give you two instances for this, the first of a *Saint*, and the second of an *Angel*.

1. The first instance I shall give you is of a Saint, namely, that of *Peter*, Act. 10. 25. *As Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him*: but Vers. 26. *Peter took him up,*

saying, Stand up, I my self also am a man. The Argument is this: No *man* is to be *worshipped*; But I am a *man*; Therefore I am not to be *worshipped.* Nor is it reasonable to believe, that *Cornelius* would give Religious Worship in the highest degree, which our Adversaries say is proper unto God alone, unto St. *Peter*; for it is said, *Act.* 10. 2. That *Cornelius was a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, and one that prayed unto God alway.* Nor can it justly be imagined, that a devout man, and one that feared God, and one that prayed unto God alway, should give Religious Worship in the highest degree, which they call *Latriam*, unto St. *Peter*, when he knew he was God's Minister, and not God.

2. The second Instance that I shall give you, is of an *Angel*, Rev. 19. 10. *I fell at his feet to worship him; and he said unto me, see thou do it not, I am thy fellow-servant, see thou do it not*: hereby is signified unto us the heinousness of this sin; as if he had said, beware what thou dost, God forbid that a creature should joyn in co-partnership with God in his worship; *worship God, see thou do it not*; a speech something like that, *Jer.* 44. 4. *Oh do not this abominable thing that I hate*, ver. 3. *They went to burn incense, and to serve other gods, whom they knew not*; and God cried out, as it were with a shriek, *Oh do not this abominable thing that I hate*: thus in the like case, when *John* fell down at the feet of the Angel to worship him, the Angel refuses it with abhorrence and detestation, *See thou do it not*; and he gives this reason for it, *I am thy fellow-servant*: and the argument is this; No servant of Christ ought to be worshipped, but an Angel is a servant of Christ, therefore an Angel is not to be worshipped: *Worship God*, as if he had said, God, and God alone is the object of religious worship, and I am thy fellow-servant; *worship God*: the Angel in this seems to point at that worship which is called *dulia*; why should *dulia* be given to him, that is δουλεία? It is an horrible wickedness to serve, and worship thy fellow servant in a religious manner: I am thy fellow-servant, *worship God*: see again to this purpose, *Rev.* 22. 8, 9. *I* John *saw these things, and heard them; and when I had heard, and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the Angel, which shewed me these things*: ver. 9. *Then saith he unto me, see thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant*, &c. *worship God.* And whereas some pretend that St. *John* took the Angel to be God, and would have worshipped him with *latria*, which is proper to God alone; and therefore the Angel says, *see thou do it not*: this is a meer groundless fancy of their own, and not to be made out by the least *iota* or tittle in the Text; and besides, it is very much that Saint *John* should be mistaken twice in the case, for he was twice repulsed by the Angel, and St. *John* calls him expresly an Angel; *ver.* 8. *I fell down to worship before the feet of the Angel*, and the Angel bids him *worship God*: by which is intimated, that St. *John*'s mistake was not in the person, but in the worshipping of the person; for that religious worship, though in the lowest, and most inferior

ſcrior degree, is ſuch, that neither Saint nor Angel durſt own or receive.

4. It appears yet further, that God, and God alone is and ought to be the object of religious worſhip, and that religious worſhip ought not to be given to any creature whatſoever, from the conſideration of the nature of worſhip it ſelf, together with that God that is to be worſhipped: religious worſhip *in Solidum*, as well in one degree as another, is due to God, and proper only unto him: as there is no proportion between God and a creature, becauſe there is an infinite diſtance between the one and the other; ſo it follows, that if it were poſſible, there ſhould be an infinite diſproportion between the honour that we give to God, and the honour that we give unto a Creature. And ſince the Divine Excellency doth differ in kind from that which is, or can poſſibly be in any Creature, it neceſſarily follows, that the Worſhip and Honour that is given unto God, ought to differ in kind from that Worſhip and Honour that we give unto the Creature: ſo that to give the ſame Worſhip unto God and to the Creature, differing only in degree, is in effect to ſay, that the Creature is but in a degree inferiour unto God. Unto which I might add,

5. In the fifth place, That if Idolatry conſiſts only in giving Religious Worſhip in the higheſt degree unto a Creature, then the *Arrians* are falſly charged with Idolatry by ancient and modern Divines, for giving Religious Worſhip unto Chriſt, who, they ſay, is but a Creature, though the beſt of Creatures: I ſuppoſe that even our Adverſaries themſelves make no ſcruple to charge *Arrians* with Idolatry: Now it is not eaſily to be imagined, how the *Arrians* ſhould give *Latriam*, or Religious Worſhip in the higheſt degree unto Chriſt, whom they profeſs to be a Creature, and not God; and if Religious Worſhip in an inferiour degree may be given unto a Creature, why then are they charged with Idolatry?

Unto which I might alſo add, That this will juſtifie at leaſt many of the beſt and wiſeſt of the Heathens in their Superſtitious and Idolatrous practices, many of the Heathens Worſhipping the true God by falſe *mediums*: for inſtance, the men of *Athens*, *Act.* 17. 23. *As I paſſed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an Altar with this Inſcription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD: whom therefore you ignorantly worſhip, him declare I to you*; and yet the Apoſtle charges them with Superſtition, Verſ. 22. *I perceive that in all things you are too ſuperſtitious*: the Altar was dedicated unto the ſame God that *Paul* preached, and yet even in this they were too ſuperſtitious.

Thus I have endeavoured to clear this great truth unto you, That God, and God alone is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worſhip; and, That Religious Worſhip ought not to be given unto any Creature whatſoever. If it be ſaid, That Religious Worſhip upon occaſion hath been given unto a Creature, as for inſtance, upon Gods appearing;

pearing unto *Moſes* in the Burning Buſh, *Exod.* 3. 5. God ſaid unto *Moſes*, *Draw not nigh hither, put off thy ſhooes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou ſtandeſt is holy ground.* And thus the Iſraelites were to Worſhip before the Ark, even by the appointment of God himſelf, *Pſal.* 99. 5. *Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worſhip at his footſtool, for he is holy.* Now if ſo, how is this a truth, That God, and God alone is the Object of Religious Worſhip; and, That Religious Worſhip ought not to be given unto any Creature whatſoever? For the removing of this difficulty, I ſhall ſay two things.

1. That in whatever place God is pleaſed to manifeſt his ſpecial and extraordinary preſence, that place, during that time, may be ſaid to be holy, or to be ſanctified; and thus it was in the caſe of the holy ground, *Exod.* 3. 2. *The Angel of the Lord appeared to him in a flame of fire, out of the midſt of a Buſh.* Now that this Angel of the Lord was God himſelf, appears Verſ. 4. *When the Lord ſaw that he turned aſide to ſee, God called unto him out of the midſt of a Buſh:* upon this the Lord ſaid, *Draw not nigh hither, put off thy ſhooes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou ſtandeſt is holy ground.* And ſo alſo as for the Ark, God had promiſed his ſpecial preſence there, and to *commune with his people from above the Mercy-ſeat, from between the two Cherubims which were upon the Ark of the Teſtimony*, Exod. 25. 22. And hence God is ſaid to dwell between the Cherubims, *Pſal.* 80. 1. *Give ear, O Shepherd of Iſrael, thou that leadeſt Joſeph like a flock, thou that dwelleſt between the Cherubims, ſhine forth.* And hence the Shewbread that was placed upon a Table before the Ark, is ſaid to be ſet before God, *Exod.* 25. 39. *Thou ſhalt ſet upon the Table Shewbread before me alway*; and this Bread was therefore called *panis facierum*, the Bread of faces, and *panis propoſitionis*, becauſe it was placed before the Ark. But I ſhall add, that there is no place under the Goſpel that can be ſaid to be holy upon the account of God's ſpecial and extraordinary preſence: if there be any ſuch, let our Adverſaries ſhew us where it is, and give us ſufficient proof of it, and we will frankly comply with them, and grant that place to be holy and ſanctified.

2. The ſecond thing that I ſay is this, That although *Moſes* was to put off his ſhooes becauſe the place whereon he ſtood was holy ground, yea, and that reſpect was given to the ground becauſe of God's ſpecial and extraordinary preſence in that place, which was ſignified by putting off the ſhooes. (Take this for granted); yet how doth it appear that the reſpect given to the ground was Religious, or that Religious Worſhip was given to the ground? Oh, ſay our Adverſaries, becauſe it was holy. Grant it, the ground was holy, but muſt it therefore be worſhipped religiouſly? If you form this into an Argument, it runs thus: Whatever is holy, ought to be worſhipped religiouſly: But the Lord tells you the ground was holy; Therefore it ought to be worſhipped religiouſly. But who ſees not the weakneſs of the firſt Propoſition, namely,

namely, That whatever is holy ought to be worſhipped religiouſly? *Aaron* was holy, and the Prieſts under the Law were holy, but yet we read not that they were worſhipped religiouſly, or with Religious Worſhip, either living or dead, much leſs did they worſhip their Garments, though they alſo were holy. We have, or at leaſt we ought to have a reſpect for the people of God, as ſuch, as they are religious and holy perſons; and yet it doth not follow from hence, that therefore they are religiouſly to be worſhipped: Yea, the people of God are holy, if compared with the holy ground it ſelf, in an eminent and tranſcendent manner: *for after God*, i. e. after the image of God, *they are created in righteouſneſs and true holineſs:* the ground was only capable of relative holineſs, but the people of God are enriched and beautified with inherent holineſs; and are ſanctified, not only in a way of external Relation as the ground was, but inwardly, and inherently in their lives they are ſanctified throughout, both in body, ſoul and ſpirit; and yet they are not to be worſhipped with Religious Worſhip.

As for that inſtance concerning the Ark, that alſo is called holy, *Pſal.* 99. 5. *Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worſhip at his footſtool, for he is holy*, ſo our Tranſlation renders it; or as it is in the Margent of the Bible, *for it is holy:* which way ſoever you render the words, it is much at one to our purpoſe, for although the Jews worſhipped God at his Footſtool, or before the Ark, which was his Footſtool, yet it doth not appear that they worſhipped his Footſtool, no not with Religious Worſhip in a leſſer or inferiour degree. The Iſraelites might worſhip God before the Ark, and yet not worſhip the Ark: thus the Wiſe-men worſhipped Chriſt wrapped in Swadling-cloaths, laid in a Manger; but yet they did not worſhip either the Cloaths or the Manger: thus thoſe that ſung *Hoſanna to the Son of David, Hoſanna in the higheſt*, worſhipped Chriſt riding upon an Aſs, but they did not worſhip the Aſs it ſelf: whatever reſpect therefore was given to the ground, or to the Ark, it doth not appear that it was religious: if any be offended with the word Civil, and take it to be too low a word in a caſe of this nature, by my conſent we will not be angry about words, let them call it; if they pleaſe, *Supercivilis*; or if they will but acknowledge that it was not the ſame Worſhip for kind that we give unto God, the ſtrife, as far as this goes, ſhall be at an end, and we ſhall be beholding to them for a better word, when they ſhall be at leiſure to furniſh us therewith.

Uſe 1. We may take notice from hence of the Superſtition and Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*; in giving that Worſhip that is proper unto God, and unto him alone, unto other things; and here I ſhall not ſpeak to the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome* in the latitude of it, but take occaſion to make mention of their worſhipping of Saints, and their worſhipping of Images.

1. Their worſhipping of Saints. Our Adverſaries tell us, that we do them wrong when we ſay that they give that Worſhip unto the Creature, that

that is proper unto God, and do frankly acknowledge that if they do so, they should make a Creature a God, and by consequence be guilty of Idolatry. But how they will or can acquit themselves in this particular, for my part I cannot understand: for actions, or gestures, or words, directed to any Creature, that doth imply that Creature to have any of God's incommunicable Attributes, and Divine Perfections, do questionless give that honour to the Creature which is proper unto God; and this is done by those of the Church of *Rome*: for instance, when thousands of Papists in thousands of places at one and the same time pray unto Saints, and in particular to the Virgin *Mary*, doth not this suppose the Saints, and in particular the Virgin *Mary*, to be Omniscient, and Omnipresent? And are not these some of God's incommunicable Attributes, and Divine Perfections? And is not the Omniscience and Omnipresence of God one main ground of Religious Worship? And is not God to be invoked every where, because he sees and hears whatsoever is done upon the Earth, and is present in all places? *I will*, saith the Apostle, 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. *that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting.* We have no reason to lift up holy hands to a Saint, unless that Saint was every where: And whereas some pretend that the Saints may see all things in God *in speculo deitatis*, in the Glass of the Deity; this Glass hath long since been broken by the hand of the Learned, nor is there any thing else like to be seen by it, but the rashness of some bold persons, who dare to sport with Divine things, and aspire unto a wisdom above that which is written, the Scripture not in the least making mention of any such thing: yea, the Humanity of Christ himself, though personally united unto the Divine Nature, did not pretend to it; for our Saviour speaking of the Day of Judgment, doth freely and openly declare to all the world, *Mark* 13. 32. *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father:* Nor can the meaning be that the Son knew not of the Day of Judgment in this sense, namely, so as to make it known unto the world, for in that sense the Father himself may be said to know nothing of that day and hour, when he is plainly excepted in the case, *Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* And seeing *operari sequitur esse*, and every being doth exercise its operations in such a way as is suitable to its nature and essence, it is an hard matter to conceive that a finite Creature can be capable of infinite knowledge, and exercise it accordingly: but I shall not insist upon this, because it is to be managed by another hand: however, I shall take my liberty to add hereunto two Considerations, and so pass on.

1. We Protestants acknowledge that we have an honour for the blessed Apostles, and Martyrs, and Saints, and upon occasion give them their due praises, and celebrate their memorials: but those of the Church of *Rome*, whilst they would most superstitiously give them that honour

that

that is due to God, most unrighteously deny them that honour that is due unto themselves. Is it an honour to the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles, to suppress what they writ, said and did, from the greatest part of the Christian World? When our Saviour says upon occasion of a womans bringing a Box of pretious Oyntment, and pouring it upon his head as he sate at meat, *Mat.* 26. 7, 13. *That wheresoever this Gospel should be preached, there should also this that this woman had done, be told for a memorial of her.* The Apostle's counsel is, *Jam.* 5. 10. *Take, my Brethren, the Prophets, who have spoken in the Name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience.* Now is it an honour to the Prophets for the generality of the people to be kept in such gross ignorance of the holy Scriptures, that it is a wonder if millions of them know what kind of persons the Prophets were, and whether there were such that ever lived in the World? Is it an honour to the Saints departed to aver, that for some time at least, and it is hard to know how long, that they suffer the same pains and torments for substance that the damned suffer in Hell, and that all this time they are deprived of the Beatifical Vision of God's blessed presence in the other World? *Absolom* had rather die than to live in exile, and not see the King's face, 2 *Sam.* 14. 32. *Let me see the King's face, and if there be any iniquity in me, let him kill me.* And is it a small matter for the Saints, for many Generations, to be shut out of the presence of their heavenly Father, and banished from his sight, who is the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords? Thus the pretended honour that the Papists say they give unto the Saints, vanishes into Air and Smoke.

2. That although we have an honour for the blessed Apostles, Saints and Martyrs, yet we dare not give them Religious Honour, no not in any degree whatsoever; for this is due to God, and proper to him alone: when we attribute that to a Creature which is proper and peculiar unto God, we make that a God. Thus *Jacob* to *Rachel* importunately desiring Children, *Gen.* 30. 2. *Jacob's anger was kindled against Rachel, and he said, Am I in God's stead, who hath with-held from thee the fruit of the womb?* Thus also when *Naaman* was sent into *Samaria* to be cured of his Leprosie, and brought a Letter to the King of Israel from the King of *Syria* to that purpose, 2 *King.* 5. 6. *Saying, Now when this Letter is come unto thee, behold, I have therewith sent Naaman my servant to thee, that thou mayst recover him of his Leprosie.* Vers. 7. *It came to pass when the King of Israel had read the Letter, that he rent his cloaths, and said, Am I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his Leprosie?* Thus it is also in the case of Worship, if we give that Worship to a Creature that is proper unto God, we make it a God. *Exod.* 34. 14. *Thou shalt worship no other gods,* and the reason rendred is this, *For the Lord whose Name is Jealous, is a jealous God.* God's Name is Jealous; and why is his Name so? why is his Name Jealous? Because as men are made known and distinguished

by their names from other men, so God is made known by his Name Jealous, and distinguished from other gods, from false gods: false gods were not jealous, though their Lovers and Worshippers went a whoring after other gods: if they worshipped them, and served them, all was well enough, they were not jealous. But the Lord our God is a Jealous God, and will not admit of any Co-partner or Rival in his Love, in his Worship; *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Thus much for their worshipping of Saints.

2. The second thing I shall mention is their worshipping of Images; this is expresly forbid by the second Commandment. *Exod.* 20. *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the Earth beneath, or that is in the Water under the Earth: thou shalt not bow down thy self to them, nor serve them.* That God had a special regard to Religion in this Commandment, is plain.

1. Because it is said, We are not to bow down our selves to them, nor serve them.

2. Because this Commandment belongs to the first Table, which concerns God's Worship and Service, and the Papists are transgressors of this Commandment, for they make unto themselves Images, and fall down and worship them.

And whereas it is urged, That suppose the Worship of the true God by an Image were forbidden by the second Commandment, it would follow indeed from hence, that it was unlawful to worship God by an Image, but not that it was Idolatry. This is but a pretence; for to give religious respect unto any Creature whatsoever, is Idolatry: now that the Worship given by Papists unto images is religious, appears, because they tell us, that the worship of an Image stays not there, but is referred or carried to the Prototype, or thing represented by it; and therefore must of necessity be the same in kind that is given to God himself: for he that tells you, that he doth it but improperly, indirectly, in this or that manner, acknowledges he doth the thing, and only tells you the manner how; and if the manner doth not destroy the thing, then it remains still the same kind of Worship, and for all these distinctions it is Idolatry. And besides, to comply with any way of Worship which is not of Divine appointment and institution, is not only a transgression of the second Commandment, but ought to be accounted one kind of Idolatry; and the reason is this, because hereby we give the honour unto a Creature, which is proper only unto God: for as God alone is to be worshipped, so again he alone can appoint the way or means whereby he will be worshipped: And this is so signally a part of his Sovereignty and Authority over his Creature, that implicitely, and by way of interpretation, we make them our God unto whom we submit in any way or kind of Worship, which is not of Divine institution. And hence the Israelites are said to worship Devils, *Levit.* 17. 7. *They shall no more offer their*

their Sacrifices unto Devils, after whom they have gone a whoring. Not that the Devil was at best directly the Object of their Worship, but because he hath a great stroke in bringing into the World all kind of false Worship, and men in conformity hereunto pay him that observance and homage that is proper unto God, and in that respect may be said to Worship the Devil.

Our Adversaries plead for themselves, that they worship not a false god, nor the Image of any false god, but the sacred Images of Saints and Angels, and the blessed Virgin *Mary*, and the like, and that adoration must and ought to be given to those, and that for their sakes whom they represent: but if religious respect or honour be given to an Image for the sake of him whom it represents, this is an unquestionable Argument against the worshipping of Images: for seeing it is certain that no Religious Worship is due unto the Saints themselves, much less may it be given to an Image for their sakes.

And here I shall take an occasion to give you an account of what the *Council of Trent* says concerning Images, Sess. 25. *That the Images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin-Mother of God, and other Saints, are to be kept and reserved, especially in Churches, and due honour and veneration to be given to them,* (by honour and veneration I suppose they mean more than civil) *not for that any Divinity or Virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any confidence to be placed in them, as was anciently done by the Heathens, who put their trust in Idols, but because the honour which is exhibited to Images is referred to the Prototype or thing represented by them: So that by the Image which we kiss, and before which we kneel or put off our Hats, we adore Christ, and reverence his Saints, whom the said Images represent.* Thus that *Council*. Now let us see whether the Jews might not have had the same or the like plea for the purging of themselves from Idolatry in their worshipping the Brazen Serpent in *Hezekiah*'s time. When the Brazen Serpent had not that healing Virtue unto which it was designed by God at first, might not they have said that they gave due honour and veneration to the Brazen Serpent, not for that any Divinity or Virtue was believed to be in it, or that any thing was to be asked of it, or any confidence to be placed in it, but in memory of those great and wonderful Cures that had formerly been wrought by it, and that by the appointment and institution of God himself, and what they did, was rather in honour to God, than unto it; and whatever veneration was given to the Brazen Serpent, it was for God's sake, and was ultimately to be resolved upon him. Let the Papists look to it, whether they have a better plea for themselves in their pretended due honour and veneration that they give unto Images, than the Jews had for their Idolatrous practices.

If any should say, But doth not Nature teach us, that the honour or dishonour done to a Picture or Image, reflects upon the person repre-

sented by it? Is it not an honour to a Prince to kiss his Picture, and a dishonour to abuse it, or deface it? And therefore is it not an honour to God to do the like, and to give due veneration and adoration unto his Image? For answer to this, take into your Consideration these following particulars.

1. That it is supposed by this Quereſt, that an Image or Picture may be made of God, which ought to be denied, and not taken for granted: *Esay* 40. 17. *All Nations before him are as nothing, and they are counted to him less than nothing and vanity:* And it follows, Verſ. 18. *To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeneſs will ye compare unto him?* And why should we make an Image of God that is not like him? But our Adversaries tell us, That Images or Pictures made with reference unto God, may be considered two ways: In a proper sense, as if a man should conceive God to have eyes, and ears, and hands, and other bodily parts as we have, and represent him accordingly by an Image; and this our Adversaries themselves acknowledge to be an infinite disparagement unto the Divine Nature, because God being infinite and invisible, can by no means be represented as he is in himself by any corporeal likeness or figure: Or in a metaphorical and allusive sense, as representing such things as bear a certain analogy or proportion to some Divine Properties, and thereupon are apt to raise our minds to the knowledge and contemplation of the Perfections themselves; as when God appeared to *Daniel* as the *Antient of Days*, this was to manifest his Wisdom and Eternity; and the *Holy Ghost* as a Dove, this was to signifie his Purity and Simplicity. Now, say they, to make an Image of God in this sense, is no way dishonourable to him, because it is not made to represent the Divine Nature by an immediate or proper similitude, but by analogy only, or metaphorical signification: and these Images are usually called by way of distinction Symbolical Images of God. Unto which we say,

1. That the making of any Image of God is forbidden in Scripture: *Deut.* 4. 15. *Take good heed unto your selves, for ye saw no manner of similitude in the day that the Lord spake to you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire*; Verſ. 16. *Lest ye corrupt your selves, and make you a graven Image, the similitude of any figure, the likeneſs of male or female*: where God did not forbid them the making of the Images of false gods, or that any veneration or worship should be given unto them; this is plain from the Text, *Ye saw no manner of similitude*; the meaning is not that they saw no similitude of any false god, but of the God that spake to them in *Horeb*; whereupon the Lord gives them this caution, *Take ye therefore good heed to your selves, lest ye corrupt your selves, or make you a graven Image, the similitude of any figure*, &c.

If it be said, That they were to take heed lest they corrupted themselves by making an Image of God, in a proper sense, as is before explained, but they were not forbidden to make a Symbolical Image of God; It is replyed,

1. I demand, Where there is any ground in that Text for such a distinction between a proper and a Symbolical Image of God? The words of the Law are comprehensive & general, *Take heed lest you corrupt your selves, or make you a graven Image, the similitude of any figure:* and the reason rendred by God is, *for you saw no manner of similitude in the day the Lord spake to you in Horeb*, Mark, no manner of similitude, no not so much as Symbolical.

2. Such an Image of God is forbidden, that we are to take great heed to our selves lest we corrupt our selves in the making of it: Now there is no such great danger for a man to represent God to himself by an Image in a proper sense, as if God had eyes, and hands, and feet, as we have, at least such are not in danger that are any thing acquainted with the holy Scriptures, which expresly tell us, that *God is a Spirit*, and that *he will be worshipped in spirit and in truth.* 'Tis to be feared indeed, that the poor ignorant Laity amongst the Papists may be in some danger by this means: but knowing persons amongst the Protestants, even those of the Laity, are not. If it be said, it is true, the people of Israel saw no similitude on the day that God spake to them in *Horeb*, but afterwards God made himself known to them by outward figures and similitudes; to *Daniel*, as the Ancient of Days, to our Saviour in the shape of a Dove; and besides, the parts and members of man's body, are sometimes in Scripture ascribed unto God, as eyes, and hands, and feet, &c. and why may not we represent God as he hath been pleased to represent himself? To this it is replyed, That God may, as he pleaseth, make known himself unto his people by some visible tokens of his extraordinary presence. But then consider,

1. That which God was pleased to do sometimes for holy reasons best known unto himself, is not the Rule of our actions, the Word of God is a sufficient Rule, and the only Rule; and if we would know what sin is, and what duty is, we must take our measures from thence: That in matters of Worship we may sin, in imitating God himself otherwise than he hath commanded in his Word; We have a famous instance for this in *Jeroboam*, 1 Reg. 12. 32. *Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah*; and yet you see he is branded for this by the Spirit of God in the Scriptures.

2. We never read that *Moses* and the Prophets took care that any Figure or Image should be made of God, no not a Symbolical Image; and it is very strange that they should be so much wanting to themselves, and to the Generation wherein they lived, if they were such excellent helps to Devotion, as some pretend.

3. Though God sometimes by outward Figures and Similitudes gave notice of his extraordinary presence, yet it was to persons eminent for holiness, and of great and singular wisdom in Divine things, as *Abraham*, *Moses*, *Daniel*, and such like Worthies, and such as were able to give a right judgment of things of this nature: but when God spake unto the people in *Horeb* out of the midst of the fire, they saw no manner

of

of similitude, lest they might corrupt themselves in the making of a graven Image, and might have gross and carnal notions concerning God: And indeed I cannot but wonder at our Adversaries, when they call Images Lay-mens Books, or the Books of the unlearned: Had the use of Images been appropriated to the more knowing and learned persons, it would have been more tolerable, there might be some pretence that such persons might from sensible and material representations be raised up to divine and heavenly meditation, even of things surpassing sense: but to conceive that the vulgar and ignorant sort of people, (and the generality of people are so, and ought to be so according to the Popish Principles) I say, to think that they who are in a manner made up altogether of sense, should be taught to worship an infinite, spiritual, invisible Being, by fixing their eyes upon finite corporeal Objects of sense, seems to me to be the first-born of incredibilities.

And whereas it is said that we cannot conceive of God but by forming Ideas of him in our minds, which are so many Pictures and Representations of God: this is true; but then withal we must consider, that these Forms and Representations of God in our fancies, arise from our natural constitution, from our finite and corporeal nature, and ought to be bewailed, and therefore is no argument for worshipping God in any corporeal Form; for this may betray us so much the more to gross and undue notions and conceptions concerning God; nor are our imaginations to guide our understanding, but our understandings must rectifie and regulate our imaginations.

4. These outward figures and signs of God's special and extraordinary presence, continued only for a time, and for some extraordinary service for which God had designed them, and then disappeared; and it is absurd for any to think, that which was by peculiar and extraordinary dispensation, should become a constant and ordinary rule unto all Generations.

5. 'Tis true, that the parts and members of man's body are sometimes ascribed unto God in Scripture, as eyes, and hands, and feet, *&c.* but it is ridiculous from Tropes, and Metaphors, and Figurative Expressions, to form an argument for Pictures and Images: for if so, we may represent God as the Sun, as a Fountain, as Fire, as a Rock; and Christ as an Hen with Chickens under his Wings; for these are ascribed to God and Christ in Scripture; and yet I conceive that Papists themselves would not give any countenance to Pictures of this nature. Unto which might be added, that it is not likely that we should be misled into errour by such passages as those, when the Scripture elsewhere tells us expressly that *God is a Spirit:* but these pretended Images of God speak not, nor give us any notice of our danger. Yea, in those very places of Scripture, at least some of them, where eyes, and hands, and feet are ascribed unto God, we may find enough to prove that God is infinite and incomprehensible: for instance, when it is said that *Heaven*

is

is God's Throne, and the *Earth his Footstool*, where at first view it seems to be insinuated, as if God had feet, and made use of the Earth as his Footstool; yet if we seriously consider the whole as it is ascribed unto God, we shall find that it plainly enough speaks God to be an infinite Being: for when it is said, that the whole *Heaven is God's Throne*, and the whole *Earth his Footstool*, it would not only be absurd, but monstrously ridiculous for any to conceive, that a body like unto mans should be capable of such qualifications, as at the same time to make Heaven its Throne, and the Earth its Footstool. So when God is said to deliver Israel *by a mighty hand, and a stretched-out arm*, there is no man can understand it thus, as if God stretched forth his Arm out of Heaven upon the Earth for the deliverance of his people, but that by God's Arm is meant God's Power, and that it is called his Hand or Arm improperly, and after the manner of men: thus the holy Scriptures have well provided for the people of God against errours and mistakes concerning God. But how the pretended Images of God may acquit themselves in this particular, our Adversaries should do well to advise: And therefore let me caution you in God's Name, lest you corrupt your selves in making any graven Image of God; and I do it so much the rather, because men have a great fancy to have a God that they may see with their eyes, or at least some visible representations of God; for they think if he should be out of sight, he would be out of mind also. And hence Papists, and Popishly affected persons are more for being at Mass, than for hearing of a Sermon; they had rather see their God, than hear another speak eloquently of him; and therefore take heed lest ye corrupt your selves in this kind. And this is the first thing that I would say to this enquiry, Whether it be not an honour to God that due Veneration and Adoration be given to his Image or Picture, namely, that this supposes that an Image or Picture may be made of God, which we deny.

2. The second thing that I would say by way of reply to this enquiry, is this, That civil honour may be paid to the Images of Kings and Princes, but it doth not follow from hence that the Images of Christ and of the Saints may have a religious respect paid to them: the Images of Kings and Princes are civil things, and therefore may have civil honour; if the Images of Christ and the Saints were sacred, as the other are civil, there might be some colour for what they say; but that they are sacred or holy, is to be proved, and till then we leave it to our Adversaries to take it into consideration.

3. That it is granted that the abuse or the defacing of the Image of a Prince, redounds to the dishonour of that Prince whom it represents; but I hope no indignity is offered to a Prince by breaking apieces those Pictures that he had expresly forbidden should be graven, or painted, or made, and that under a severe penalty: indeed the abuse of those things that are of divine Institution, as of the Elements in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or the Water in Baptism, doth redound unto God him-

himself; but what is this to an Image of mans devising? and that not only without any warrant from God, but expresly against his will and commandments? If a man should break apieces, or throw into the fire the Coin that comes into his hands that is false or counterfeit, though it had the Princes Image or stamp upon it; yet it would be no dishonour to the Prince to deal so by it, but rather a piece of homage and reverence to his Authority.

For the further clearing of this matter in controversie between us and our Adversaries of *Rome*, concerning the Veneration and Adoration that they say may be given to Images, we will consider that Images may be worshipped two manner of ways.

1. *Terminative*, that is, when people terminate their worship on an Image, as if it were God, without looking any further than it; and this is likely to be the sin of the more brutish sort of the blind Heathens, and of many ignorant Papists to this day; and this kind of Idolatry is forbidden by the first Commandment, this is plain upon this ground; If the first Commandment expresly enjoins us to have no other gods but *Jehovah*, then to worship an Image as God is forbidden by this Commandment; so that by making a graven Image in the second Commandment, and falling down before it, and worshipping of it, something else must be understood than the worshipping of it *terminative* as God; and therefore

2. Images may be worshipped *relative*, and with respect to the true God; and in this sense our Adversaries of the Church of *Rome* would maintain their worship of Images: now this also is unlawful, and forbidden by the second Commandment. In this sense the Papists in our days are guilty of Idolatry, and the Jews of old were guilty of Idolatry; for the Jews, at least many of them, did not worship the Images themselves, but the true God by them; and this will appear by instances out of the sacred Scripture.

1. The first instance that I shall give you, shall be that of the Golden Calf, of which we read *Exod.* 32. That the worshipping of the Calf was Idolatry, is plain 1 *Cor.* 10. 7. *Neither be ye Idolaters, as were some of them, as it is written, The people sate down to eat and drink, and rose up to play*; where the Apostle refers to the peoples worshipping of the Calf, *Exod.* 32. 6. *They rose early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings; and the people sate down to eat and drink, and rose up to play*; and yet the Israelites did not fall into the Heathenish Idolatry by so doing, that is, they did not worship the Calf as God, but worshipped the true God by the Calf. I know the Papists with great bitterness inveigh against the Protestants for teaching of this Doctrine; nor do I wonder at it; for what is like to become of the Popish darling principle of worshipping the true God by an Image, if the Israelites, for doing the same thing according to the judgment of God himself, were Idolaters? Now therefore that which will be proved is this,

this, That the Iſraelites did not worſhip the Calf as God, but the true God by the Calf; and that will appear by theſe following Conſiderations.

1. Becauſe the Calf was dedicated and conſecrated to the ſervice of the true God, as appears by what *Aaron* ſaid and did in that caſe, *Exod.* 32. 5. *When Aaron ſaw it, he built an Altar before it, and Aaron made Proclamation, and ſaid, To morrow is a Feaſt to the Lord*, or unto *Jehovah*; and *Aaron* uſeth the Name *Jehovah*, that he might make the beſt of a bad matter, that the people might not terminate their Worſhip on the Idol, but on the true God. And our Adverſaries ſeem to yield to the force of this Scripture, when they do acknowledge, that *Aaron* perhaps, and ſome of the wiſer amongſt the Iſraelites, might not be ſo ſottiſh as to worſhip the Calf as God: but they ſhould conſider alſo, that *Aaron* did not ſpeak ſo much his own ſenſe, but by this means would give notice to the people how to regulate and order their devotion; and if they would be ſo mad as to worſhip the Calf, in ſo doing, they ſhould have reſpect unto the true God, unto *Jehovah*, and worſhip him by it; and accordingly *he makes Proclamation, and ſays, To morrow is a Feaſt to Jehovah.*

If it be ſaid, the Idol was called by the Name *Jehovah*, and therefore they worſhipped that as God; we reply, That this is *gratis dictum* ſaid, but not proved: for *Aaron* doth not ſay, To morrow is a Feaſt to the Calf *Jehovah*, but, To morrow is a Feaſt to *Jehovah*: and ſuppoſe it were ſo, that the Calf was called *Jehovah*, this may be underſtood of that religious Worſhip and Honour which they gave unto the Calf, which is ſo proper and peculiar unto God, that either that is God which we thus worſhip, or elſe we make it ſo. *Pſal.* 106. 19, 20. 'tis ſaid of Iſrael, *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worſhipped the molten Image: thus they changed their glory into the ſimilitude of an Ox that eateth Graſs*: The meaning is not, that the Iſraelites thought that God in his Nature and Being was like unto an Ox; but by giving the Calf religious honour, by worſhipping the graven Image, by giving that glory which is due to God unto an Ox, they did in a ſenſe change their glory into the ſimilitude of an Ox that eateth Graſs. Thus when Iſrael is charged with ſaying, *Jer.* 2. 27. *to a Stock, Thou art my Father; and a Stone, Thou haſt brought me forth*; this is not to be underſtood ſtrictly; ſurely they had been groſſer Stocks than thoſe that they worſhipped, if it entred into their thoughts that a Stock made them, or was their Father, or a Stone brought them forth, but becauſe they gave ſome religious reſpect to thoſe Stocks and Stones, they did in a ſenſe change the Glory of God into a Stock, and into a Stone; and by interpretation, *ſay to a Stock, Thou art my Father; and to a Stone, Thou haſt brought me forth.*

2. It further appears, that the Iſraelites did not worſhip the Calf it ſelf as God, but the true God by the Calf, as by what *Aaron* ſaid, ſo by what the people ſaid, *Exod.* 32. 4. *Theſe be thy gods, O Iſrael, which*

brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt. Now though they ſay gods, becauſe the word in the *Hebrew* is in the plural number; yet according to the uſage of the word in other places of Scripture, we muſt underſtand by it one God, and ſo the Scripture expounds it elſewhere, *Neh.* 9. 18. *This is thy God that brought thee up out of Egypt:* They called the Calf God by an uſual *Metonymy*, by giving of the Name of the thing ſignified unto the ſign; as the *Images* of the Cherubims are called Cherubims, *Exod.* 25. 18. and the *Images* of Oxen are called Oxen, 1 *Reg.* 7. 25. ſo then the meaning of this Scripture is this, *Theſe be thy gods, O Iſrael*; that is to ſay, This is the ſign and token of the preſence of thy God, O Iſrael, that brought thee up out of the Land of *Egypt.* And indeed had the Calf been God, according to the notion of the idolatrous Heathens, the Calf would rather have kept them in *Egypt*, than have brought them out of *Egypt:* for look, as thoſe of the Church of *Rome* have their tutelar Saints, ſome to preſide over ſome Countries, and ſome over others; ſome to be helpful and aſſiſtant in one caſe, and ſome in another: ſo the Heathens had their tutelar and topical gods; the gods of *Egypt* themſelves would not ſtir out of *Egypt*, much leſs were they like to bring Iſrael from thence: the Heathens thought that the whole World was of too large a compaſs for one God to take care of, and therefore their notion was, that ſeveral Countries had ſeveral gods; yea, ſeveral places it may be in one and the ſame Country, had ſeveral gods; *Their gods* (ſays the *Syrians* of the *Iſraelites*) *are gods of the hills*, 1 *Reg.* 20. 23. (poſſibly collecting the ſame from the Jews uſual ſacrificing in high-places) and not the god of the plain, *Let us fight againſt them in the plain, and ſurely we ſhall be ſtronger than they.* It is likely that one god cannot be the god of the hills, and the god of the plain; and hence it is that the people that the King of *Aſſyria* ſent to the Cities of *Samaria*, and placed there, are ſaid not to know the manner of the God of the Land, *i. e.* the God of *Iſrael*, as diſtinct from the God of *Judah*, 2 *Reg.* 17. 26. Theſe were the notions that the Heathens had of their gods; and therefore if the Iſraelites were ſuch groſs Idolaters as our Adverſaries pretend they were, how could they ſay, *Theſe are thy gods, O Iſrael, that brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt?*

3. It appears yet further, that the Iſraelites did not worſhip the Calf it ſelf as God, but the true God by the Calf, from that Text of Scripture, *Act.* 7. 41, 42. *They made a Calf in thoſe days, and offered ſacrifice unto the Idols, and rejoyced in the works of their own hands.* Verſ. 42. *Then God turned, and gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven.* It is ſaid, that ſacrifice notes the higheſt piece of Worſhip and Devotion; this is ſaid, but it is more than evident that the Iſraelites had a reſpect to the true God, even when they offered ſacrifice unto the Idol: for it is ſaid, when the Iſraelites offered ſacrifice unto the Calf, that *God gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven.* Now if their Idolatry had conſiſted in worſhipping the Calf as God, it will be found to be more groſs

and

and abſurd than to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven, at leaſt it could not have been an aggravation of their ſin that they worſhipped the Hoſt of Heaven, above their worſhipping of the Calf, which is St. *Stephen*'s ſcope in this place: the meaning therefore of this Scripture is this, that becauſe they corrupted the worſhip of the true God in worſhipping of the Calf, contrary to his command, therefore God in judgment gave them up to the worſhipping of thoſe that were not gods, namely, the Hoſt of Heaven.

But is it not ſaid, That *they forgat God their Saviour?* Pſal. 106.21. and doth not this imply that they had renounced the worſhip of the true God, and worſhipped the Calf as God? I anſwer, No; this muſt not be underſtood as if they did not remember *God* at all; no, nor yet the great things which he had done in *Egypt:* but they are ſaid to forget him, becauſe they were not mindful of his Precepts, and had no regard unto his Laws; and particularly that Law, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image.* They alſo do not obey God, that do not as they ought remember God; and in this ſenſe the Iſraelites are ſaid to forget God, not becauſe they worſhipped the Calf as a falſe god, but tranſgreſſed, in worſhipping of the Calf, the Law of the true God.

But what need had the Iſraelites of the Calf, as a ſign of God's preſence going before them, when they had already the Pillar of Cloud by day, and the Pillar of Fire by night, deſigned by God for this very end? But what trifling is this? What need had they to long after the Garlick and Onions of *Egypt*, when God had provided for them *Manna*, the food of Angels, bread from Heaven? What need had *David* to contrive the death of his good ſubject *Uriah*, and after this to marry *Bathſheba* his Wife? Yea, what need have the Papiſts themſelves of Crucifixes, when they have the Sacraments of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, Memoirs of Divine appointment and inſtitution of *Chriſt*'s Death and Paſſion? Would it not be ridiculous to ſay they had no need to do it, therefore they did it not?

And ſuppoſing that the people ſhould be ſo ſtupid, as ſome pretend they were, as to think that there was a Divine Virtue inherent in the Calf; yet this doth not prove that they worſhipped the *Calf* as God: for if ſo, the Jews might conclude that the Hem of Chriſt's Garment, and the Handkerchief and ſhadow of the Apoſtles were gods, becauſe a Divine Virtue ſeemed to go forth from them: yea, and the Brazen Serpent might be thought to have been God, becauſe the ſtung Iſraelite was healed by looking up to the Brazen Serpent.

And whereas it is urged that the Iſraelites ſerved the gods of the *Egyptians* whilſt they were in *Egypt*, Joſh. 24. 14. *Now therefore fear the Lord, and ſerve him in ſincerity and in truth, and put away the gods which your fathers ſerved on the other ſide of the flood, and in Egypt:* And the Scripture ſpeaking of Iſrael, tells us, *Pſal.* 106.19. *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worſhipped the molten Image.* In anſwer to this, we ſay,

That it is not unuſual for God to charge a people going on in ways of wickedneſs and diſobedience, with that which is ſuitable enough with what they do, and the intention of the work, though far enough off from the deſign and intention of the Worker: Thus the Apoſtle tells us, That Covetouſneſs is Idolatry, and that there are ſome that make their Belly their God, and yet the perſons concerned far enough off either from profeſſing or deſigning any thing of this nature. Thus the Iſraelites *made a Calf in Horeb, and worſhipped the molten Image*, becauſe they gave religious worſhip to it, though their deſign and intention was far different from the Idolatry of the Heathens, that worſhipped Idols, or falſe gods. Thus I have endeavoured to clear the firſt inſtance that may be given of the Jews committing Idolatry by their worſhipping of Images, though they did not worſhip the Images themſelves, but the true God by them; and having been ſo large in this, there needs but a few words to be ſpoken to the reſt.

2. A ſecond inſtance may be that of *Jeroboam*, in his infamous ſin in ſetting up Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, whereby he made Iſrael to ſin: Now it was not *Jeroboam*'s deſign to withdraw the people altogether from the worſhip of the true God, or the worſhipping of thoſe *Calves* as gods, but to worſhip the true God by them; and that for theſe Reaſons.

1. The great deſign of *Jeroboam* in this, was, that he might ſecure the Ten Tribes unto himſelf, ſo that they might not think of returning to unite themſelves any more to the Houſe of *David*, which might poſſibly come to paſs by their going up to *Jeruſalem*, as appears from 1 *King.* 12. 26. *And Jeroboam ſaid in his heart, Now ſhall the Kingdom return to the Houſe of David.* Verſ. 27. *If this people go up to do ſacrifice in the Houſe of the Lord at Jeruſalem, then ſhall the heart of this people return again unto their Lord, even unto Rehoboam King of Judah, and they ſhall kill me, and go again to Rehoboam King of Judah:* and hence that ſaying of his, Verſ. 28. *It is too much for you to go up to Jeruſalem*; as if he ſhould ſay, Ye may worſhip God nearer home.

2. That it was not *Jeroboam*'s deſign to withdraw the people altogether from the worſhip of the true God, will further appear, becauſe the Idolatry of *Jeroboam* is diſtinguiſhed from the Idolatry of the Heathens abroad that worſhipped falſe gods, yea from the Idolatry of their Idolatrous Kings at home, as that of *Ahab*, 1 *Reg.* 16. 30. *And Ahab the ſon of Omri did evil in the ſight of the Lord above all that were before him:* ſo that *Ahab*'s Idolatry was more heinous than *Jeroboam*'s; and what other reaſon can likely be rendred for it than this, namely, *Ahab*'s ſetting up of falſe gods? for whereas it is pretended that *Ahab*'s ſin was greater than *Jeroboam*'s, becauſe *Ahab*'s ſin was the worſhipping of many gods, whereas *Jeroboam*'s ſin was worſhipping the *Calf:* as he is a greater and more heinous ſinner that commits Adultery with many, than he that committs it but with one. This is but a pretence, for it

remains

remains to be proved, that the Iſraelites did at any time, yea in the worſt of times, altogether renounce the true and living God, but in their conceit, yea and in their profeſſion acknowledge the true God ſtill: and hence it is that you ſhall read, that *Ahab*'s Prophets that were the Prophets of *Baal*, did yet Propheſie in the Name of the Lord, 1 *Reg.*22.11. *And Zedekiah the ſon of Chenaanah made him horns of Iron, and he ſaid, Thus ſaith the Lord, With theſe ſhalt thou puſh the Syrians until thou have conſumed them:* and Verſ.12. *All the Prophets propheſied ſo, ſaying, Go up to Ramoth-Gilead and proſper, for the Lord will deliver it into the Kings hand.* So that the difference between *Jeroboam*'s and *Ahab*'s Idolatry lay here; *Jeroboam*'s Idolatry conſiſted in worſhipping of the true God by an Image; but *Ahab*'s Idolatry was not only in worſhipping the true God by an Image as *Jeroboam*'s did, but in worſhipping other gods beſides him, namely, *Baal*-gods.

3. A third inſtance might be that of *Michah* and his Mother, *Judg.* 17. though his Mother made a graven Image, yet that it was for the worſhipping of the God of Iſrael, appears by the whole ſtory: ſhe profeſſes, Verſ. 3. that ſhe had wholly dedicated the ſilver that was to make a graven Image and a molten Image unto the Lord; and *Micah* himſelf conſecrates a Levite for his Prieſt, *viz.* ſeeming thereby to have reſpect to the true God in the worſhip he had deſigned; and when he had done ſo, he profeſſes, Verſ. 13. *Now know I that the Lord will do me good, ſeeing I have a Levite to my Prieſt:* yet upon this account his Mother and himſelf alſo were Idolaters.

As we may take notice of the Superſtition and Idolatry, ſo of the fraud and treachery of the Church of *Rome*, in leaving the ſecond Commandment, or at leaſt the far greateſt part of it, out of ſome of their Books: for this I ſhall mention their *Roman Catechiſm*, authorized by the *Council of Trent*, and Publiſhed by the Edict of Pope *Pius* the Fifth, where, ſpeaking of the firſt Commandment (for Papiſts make firſt and ſecond to be but one) they recite it thus, *Thou ſhalt have no other gods before me, Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image*, and ſupply the reſt with an *&c.* As alſo a Book called *Manipulas Curatorum*, containing in brief the Offices of Prieſts, according to the order of ſeven Sacraments, by *Guido de Monte*, written *Anno Dom.* 1333. where the ſecond Commandment is wholly omitted. As alſo a Book called *Opuſculum Tripartitum de Præceptis Decalogi de Confeſſione, & Arte Moriendi*, by *John Gerſon* Chancellor of *Paris*. Now this is an horrible piece of fraud and treachery, and accordingly diſowned and decreed by the Reformed Churches. *Uſe* 2.

Now for the further clearing and more diſtinct underſtanding of this matter, it will become us to take into Conſideration, that this is granted on all hands, that there are *Ten Commandments* of the Moral Law, called therefore the *Decalogue*; and that theſe *Ten Commandments* are divided into *Two Tables*; but how many belong unto the *Firſt Table*,

and

and how many unto the *Second*, that indeed is a question. The *Protestants*, or those that may be called *Calvinists* in opposition to the *Lutherans*, ascribe *Four Commandments* to the *First Table*, and *Six to the Second:* The *Papists* and *Lutherans* making the First and Second Commandment to be but one, ascribe *Three Commandments* to the *First Table*, and *Seven* to the *Second*; and to make up the number of Ten, divide that which we call the Tenth Commandment, into two, the one, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbours House*, and the other, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbours Wife, nor his Man-servant*, &c. Now this distinction of the Commandments, together with their presumptuous leaving out of the *Second Commandment* out of the *Decalogue*, is not allowed by the Churches called Reformed, for these Reasons.

1. Because by this means they sacrilegiously take away a Commandment of God, relating to his Worship and Service: for as by the first Commandment we are forbidden to worship false gods, or the Images of false gods; so by the second Commandment we are forbidden to worship the true God in a false way, or after a false manner; and in particular the worshipping of Images, or the worshipping of the true God by an Image. Now they of the Church of *Rome* being aware of this, and that they might have a covert for their Idolatrous Worship, make the first and second Commandment to be but one, and presumptuously leave the second Commandment out of the Decalogue.

2. That supposing the second Commandment (for so we say it is) was only an Appendix to the first, and an Explication of it, yet it is an horrible presumption to leave this Explication out of their Books, and particularly out of their Catechism. The Law of God ought to be made known unto the people, perfect and entire, as it was delivered by God himself: Surely God hath not given to any, no not to the best and wisest amongst the sons of men, the power of a *Deleatur*, with reference to his holy and blessed Law. And if that which we say is the second Commandment, may be razed out of our Books because it is an Explication of the first, by the same reason we may blot out the whole tenth Commandment out of the Decalogue, because it is an Explication of the whole Moral Law, and especially of the second Table, according to the notice given us by Christ himself, *Mat.* 5.28. *I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.*

And whereas it is urged, that in the rehearsal of the Commandment, our Saviour himself doth not keep exactly to the words and syllables as you have them upon record, *Exod.*20. nor to the same order as *Mat.*19. 16. when one came to Christ, and said to him, *Good Master, what good thing may I do that I may have eternal life?* Our Saviour answers him, Vers. 17. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments*; and Vers. 18. *When he saith unto him, Which?* Christ answers, *Thou shalt do no murder: Thou shalt not commit adultery: Thou shalt not steal: Thou shalt*

ſhalt not bear falſe witneſs: and Verſ. 19. *Honour thy Father and thy Mother.* And thus *Moſes* reciting the Commandments, interſerts ſomething when he ſpeaks of the fourth Commandment, *Deut.* 5. 12, 13, 14, 15. *Keep the Sabbath-day to ſanctifie it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee,* &c. Verſ. 15. *And remember that thou waſt a ſervant in the Land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a ſtretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God hath commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day:* All this muſt be acknowledged; but then there is a difference between doing this ſometime, and upon occaſion, and to do it frequently and deſignedly; and where there are but Ten Commandments, moſt ſacrilegiouſly and irreverently to deprive the people of one of them.

3. No ſufficient reaſon can be rendred, why that which we ſay is the tenth Commandment, ſhould be divided into two, but rather that it is one, and no more; and that the purport and ſcope of this Commandment is, to forbid the coveting of any thing that is our Neighbours: and if we may take the boldneſs to make the coveting of our Neighbours Houſe one Commandment, and the coveting of our Neighbours Wife another, we may by the ſame reaſon make another of coveting our Neighbours Servant, and another of coveting his Ox, or his Aſs, and ſo make twelve or thirteen Commandments, or rather as many Commandments as the things are that we covet. In a word, the Papiſts wilful declining the printing and publiſhing the ſecond Commandment for the peoples uſe, doth give any impartial Obſerver ſufficient cauſe to ſuſpect that they themſelves take it to be againſt their cauſe; and ſuppoſing that it ſhould be granted, that three Commandments belong to the firſt Table, and ſeven to the ſecond, yet it looks like a piece of fraud and unfaithfulneſs to ſuppreſs any thing of the Law, concerning which our Saviour tells us, that not one *Iota* or tittle of it ſhall fall to the ground.

Is this, Learn from hence that there is a ſweet harmony, and ſuitableneſs, and correſpondency between Divine Truths delivered unto us in the Old Teſtament, and in the New. *Moſes* in *Deuteronomy* teacheth us, *to fear the Lord our God, and ſerve him:* our *Saviour* in St. *Matthew* teaches us, *that we muſt worſhip the Lord our God, and him only muſt we ſerve.* Take the Word of God, whether you conſider the Old Teſtament or the New, the incomparable fitneſs and proportion of the Truths and Doctrines contained in them one unto another, is one great Character of the Divinity of the Scriptures; and therefore thoſe Doctrines that are urged as matters of Faith, and yet have no ſuitableneſs and correſpondency with thoſe Principles which are owned and acknowledged to be Divine Truths, but juſtle with them, and may be conſidered apart, and in a ſeparate way from them, are to be ſuſpected for deluſions and miſtakes. I ſhall take my liberty here (though not deſigned for the management of that ſubject) to inſtance in the Doctrine of *Uſe 3.*

Tranſub-

Transubstantiation: We tell our Adversaries, that if we deny our senses in those things wherein it is proper for them to give a judgment, (as we must in case we believe that the Sacramental Elements, after Consecration, are transubstantiated into the very Body and Blood of Christ) then all Religion will fall to the ground, we cannot certainly know either what we read, or what we hear; nor could they that lived in our Saviour's time, certainly know that there was such a person living upon the earth, and all the Miracles that he wrought, for ought they knew, might be Delusions, and a meer deception of their senses: so that if sense was not to be believed, Christianity it self must have fallen to the ground. This cannot be denied: but then they say that this one instance of Transubstantiation ought to be excepted from the general Rule, and ought to have its place apart, and in this particular case our senses ought to be over-ruled. Now this, amongst other things, makes the Doctrine of Transubstantiation to be suspected, because it hath not a suitableness to other matters, whereby the Verity of Christian Religion was proved and made good unto the World. Look as it is in other cases, consider the work of God, there appears a marvellous correspondence between them; the World hath its parts so united one to another, that neither the Heaven, nor the Earth, nor any of the Elements can be taken away without the ruine of the whole: And thus it is with the Principles of Christian Religion, and especially the great Truths of Christianity; take away one, and you in a manner take away all the rest. For instance, The Doctrine of the Trinity hath many Principles of Christianity that fall in with it, the Incarnation of the Son of God falls in with it, the Death and Passion of the Son of God falls in with it, the Satisfaction of the Son of God made unto Divine Justice falls in with it: But you may take away the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and all the Principles of Christian Religion will remain unshaken, yea untoucht, the Doctrine of the Sacraments not excepted: the Sacrament of Baptism will not suffer in the least by it, no nor the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper its self; for if Baptism be a Sacrament without Transubstantiation, why may not the Lord's Supper also? But this I take notice of only *in transitu*, and by the way, and so pass on.

Use 4. Let this caution us against Superstition, and all False-Worship: It is the great Interest and Concern of the Church of Christ, to keep the Worship of God pure and uncorrupt. 'Tis to be acknowledged that Satan is a great enemy to the Truths of God, as well as to the Worship of God; yet his design is rather that the Worship of God be corrupted, than the Truths of God be perverted: for he knows that it is possible for Religion to be depraved in some points, and yet many may keep themselves from defilement, and may not be tainted with the errours of the place where they live, or the Church unto which they do belong, provided the Worship of God be kept pure and uncorrupt: but if once the Worship of God be publickly corrupted by Superstition and Idolatry, it

it is next to an impoſſibility if the infection do not ſpread over the face of the whole Church, and by conſequence there can be no Communion with that Church without ſin; and hence the great buſineſs of Popery is coming to Maſs. It may be ſome Papiſts, at leaſt ſuch as are moderate, may allow you to adhere to ſome Proteſtant Principles, if you will come to the Maſs; but that is indiſpenſable.

As this ſhould caution us againſt Falſe-Worſhip in the general, ſo againſt worſhipping of God by an Image in particular. God is very jealous leſt his Worſhip ſhould be given unto Images, and hence none of the Commandments are grounded upon his jealouſie but the ſecond, which is againſt Images, and we are very prone to Superſtition and Will-worſhip in this kind. God expreſſeth himſelf moſt largely in the ſecond and fourth Commandments, becauſe men are more than ordinary inclinable to be tranſgreſſors of theſe two: A man is eaſily counſelled that he muſt not kill, that he muſt not ſteal; but that God is to be worſhipped only in that way which he hath preſcribed in his Word, and that the Lord's Day, the Chriſtian Sabbath, is to be kept holy, this may be enforced upon us, and we had need of line upon line to further us in theſe Duties; as where the Tyde is wont to run, and bear up with greater force and violence than is uſual in other places, the banks that are made for the preventing of the breaking in of the water, had need to be made ſo much the higher and the ſtronger: And whereas it is ſaid that Idols may not be worſhipped, but Images may; it is high preſumption to diſtinguiſh where God hath not: the ſecond Commandment tells us, *that we are not to make to our ſelves any graven Image, or the likeneſs of any thing*; and it expreſly forbids us, *to fall down before it, and worſhip it:* and ſurely it muſt needs be of dangerous conſequence in things that concern God's Worſhip and Service, to endeavour to elude the force and power of any Law of God by a diſtinction of our own deviſing. *Uſe* 5.

Is to counſel you to keep your ſelves from Idols; thus St. *John*, 1 *Joh.* 5. 21. *Little Children, keep your ſelves from Idols.* Idols, what are they? Some will tell you, that there is this difference between an Image and an Idol: An Image, ſay they, is a repreſentation of ſomething that hath a real being and exiſtence; an Idol, of ſomething that is feigned, and hath no being but in the minds and fancies of men; and that is the meaning, ſay they, of that place of Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 8. 4. *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World*; but this is a ſtrange miſtake: It is true, the Apoſtle ſays, *an Idol is nothing*; but how? not in reſpect of the matter of it, for ſo it is ſomething, Gold, or Silver, or Stone; no, nor in regard of the thing repreſented by it; for an Idol doth not always repreſent things feigned, and ſuch as have no exiſtence but in the imaginations of men, as Sphynxes, Tritons, Centaurs, and the like, but many times things that are real, things that are in Heaven, and things that are on Earth, as they are mentioned in the ſecond Commandment. Nor is it to be imagined that amongſt thoſe multitudes of *Uſe* 6.

Images which were worshipped by the Heathens, but that some of them at least might represent such things as had a real being and existence; and yet all such as were worshipped by them, are expressly by the Apostle called Idols, 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. *Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb Idols, even as ye were led:* but the meaning of the Apostle is this, an Idol is nothing in point of virtue and efficacy, nothing at all conducing unto Salvation; and in particular, that it hath no power at all either to sanctifie or to pollute those meats which were offered unto them, of which the Apostle speaks in that Chapter. An Idol is said to be nothing in the same sense as Circumcision is said to be nothing, and Uncircumcision nothing, 1 *Cor.* 7. 19. that is, in point of virtue and efficacy; and so the Apostle explains himself elsewhere, *Gal.* 5. 6. *For in Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith that worketh by love:* the *formale* of an Idol consists in this, that it is religiously worshipped, insomuch that which was no Idol before, immediately upon its being worshipped becomes an Idol: Thus the Brazen Serpent, that was no Idol before, upon its being worshipped became an Idol: Thus it was with the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, when the people worshipped them, and burnt incense to them, they became Idols.

Now the counsel that I give you, or rather St. *John*, is this, *Keep your selves from Idols:* They that would not be Idolaters, must keep themselves from Idols, from all things that may be enticements to that sin: in the Commandments where a sin is forbidden, all enticements and provocations to that sin are also forbidden. When God says, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, the meaning of this Commandment, according to the Exposition that our Saviour himself makes of it, is, that we must not *look upon a woman to lust after her.* And *Solomon* speaking of an Harlot, gives this counsel, *Prov.* 5. 8. *Remove thy way far from her, and come not nigh the door of her house:* And holy *Job*, *made a covenant with his eyes, not to think upon a Maid*, Job 31. 1. When God would forbid the sin of injustice, see how he expresses it, *Deut.* 25. 13. *Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small.* It was a sin for a man to have a great and a small weight in his bag; and why so? Suppose a great and a small weight were found in a mans bag, he might say, How doth it appear that I have sold Wares by one weight, and taken up Wares by another? But God would not have them lay such a snare before themselves, and therefore forbids them to have in their bags divers weights, a great and a small: So it is in this case, when we have a caution given us against Idols, *Little Children, keep your selves from Idols.* The Holy Ghost seems to meet with a secret Objection that might be made by some: We hate Idolatry, but yet to have Images to put us in mind of God, and to quicken our Devotion, provided we give them not religious Worship as others do, we hope there is no harm in this. Yes, there is; you must not only keep your selves from Idolatry, but

but you muſt keep your ſelves from Idols. Thoſe of the Church of *Rome* charge Proteſtants as if they had a mind to aboliſh and root out of the minds of men, the memory of the bleſſed Apoſtles, Confeſſors, and Martyrs, by inveighing againſt ſacred Images, and holy Reliques: but this is juſt as if a man ſhould take upon him the boldneſs to ſay, That becauſe God buried the Body of *Moſes*, *in a Valley in the Land of Moab, and no man knoweth of his Sepulchre to this day*, Deut. 34. 6. that God's deſign in all this was to blot out the Memorials of *Moſes* from the face of the whole Earth.

Let us pray unto God, that he would famiſh all the gods of the Earth; famiſhing of Idols is a Scripture-phraſe, *Zeph.* 2. 11. *The Lord will be terrible unto them, for he will famiſh all the gods of the earth, and men ſhall worſhip him.* The Pſalmiſt ſpeaking of God's Providence over his Creatures, tells us, *Pſal.* 145. 15. *The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou giveſt them their meat in due ſeaſon:* but an Idol is none of God's Creatures, an Idol hath eyes and ſees not, ears and hears not, mouth and and taſtes not. But you will ſay, How then can God famiſh them? Thus: If we would know what it is to famiſh the gods of the Earth, then we muſt conſider what their meat is; their meat is that Worſhip, and Service, and Honour, which is given them by the ſons of men; Now when God is made the ſole Object of Religious Worſhip, when men turn from dumb Idols to ſerve the living God, and him only, then God famiſhes the gods of the Earth, takes away their meat from them, and then men ſhall worſhip him, and let all good people ſay, *Amen. So be it.* *Uſe* 7.

SERMON XIV.

Protestants separated for Christ's Names sake.

Luke 6. 22. *Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you, and shall reproach you, and cast out your Name as evil for the Son of man's sake.*

ONe of the main designs of the Doctrine of the Gospel, is to unite men one to another, and to tie them together with the strongest bonds and ligaments imaginable. To this purpose it does not only forbid the doing of any wrong unto others, but it prescribes Rules for the curbing of our passions when provoked by them. Nay, it peremptorily enjoins, under the severest penalties, that we should forgive the offences done against us, and love the persons of them that do them. And that we might think it our greatest concern thus to do, it combines and gathers all, *who have any hope toward God*, into one *Body*, which is called *the Church*, who are jointly to profess *one Faith*, and to perform *one Worship*, and to serve *one Lord*: the Ligaments whereby this Body is united and tied together, being the *Sacraments*, for this end also appointed by *Christ*.

Ephes. 4. 4, 5.

Who being the *Lord of all*, is yet pleased more especially to relate to this *Body*, as its *Head*, for Direction and Government, and to influence it by his Spirit for life and motion. Now it being full as monstrous for one Head to have two Bodies, as for one Body to have two Heads. So far forth as any have hoped for Salvation by Christ, they have also pretended to belong to that *One Body*, of which he is the Head and Saviour.

In these pretensions the *Church of Rome* comes not behind any, but with as much passion, and as little reason as they of old, whom the Prophet speaks of, they cry out too, *The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord* are these. Nay, so unreasonable are they in arrogating to themselves the priviledge of this *Body*, that they challenge (as the *Donatists* before them) to be the *whole*, and not a *part* of it; confounding, for to save this their purpose, things so discrepant as the *Catholick* and *Romish Church*, (that is, the universal and a particular

Jerem. 7. 4.

cular Church) and at last the Church and the Pope too are with them but one and the same, all others being but Cyphers, and meer Insignificants to him.

And this I account none of the least reasons to suspect that they have *no part nor share* in what they so much pretend unto: for 'tis too too apparent that they have not that *mind and spirit* that was in Christ. (Now 'tis not *continuity* but *animation* that makes the several *parts* to become *one Body.*) And as the same soul that acts in the head, acts in every individual member belonging to it: so the same Spirit which was in Christ, is also in all, that as living members belong unto him. But, alas, where is that meekness and gentleness, that love and charity which our blessed Saviour so much expressed himself, so earnestly recommended unto his Disciples; nay, which he made the Test of their really being *his?* Though the *Church of Rome* yet retains the calling of Christ *Lord, Lord*, it is evident in this they do not his will. They still cry, *Hosanna* to him, and yet really *Crucifie* him, at least in his Members. They are not the followers of the humble *JESUS*, but of the proud Pharisees, from whom our Saviour foretels that his Disciples should suffer; but such sufferings as were as little to be declined, as they were hardly to be avoided, being the high-way, though a rough one, to bliss and happiness: *Blessed are ye when men shall hate you.* Joh. 13. 35.

In which words are remarkable,

1. *Suffering foretold*; in which the *Sufferers* also are described which is the *subject* in the Verse, *viz.* such as men shall *hate*, and *separate*, and *reproach*, *&c.*
2. Their *state or condition* declared, or encouragement proposed unto such, (which makes the *Prædicate*) *Blessed are ye*, *&c.*

In the former there are three things considerable.

1. *What it is* that *Christ's Disciples* and followers shall *suffer*; they shall be *hated*, *separated*, *reproached*, and have *their Names cast out.*
2. For *what cause* they shall *suffer* thus; for *the Son of Man's sake.*
3. *From whom* it is that they *suffer*, *from men*, *when men shall hate you*, *&c.*

I shall begin with the latter, as being *first* in the words of the Text, and intend to pass it over with some little reflection at present upon it. *Men* here are not considered *as in honour*, by reason of the *Image of God*, and their conformity unto God; for so they continued not: but men is *terminus diminuens*, a term synonymous with *World*, which our Saviour speaks of elsewhere; denoting such as are put in contra-distinction unto them that are chosen out of the World. It reflects their *fall* and degeneracy upon them. Nay, they whom Christ's Disciples suffer.

From whom Christ's Disciples suffer. Homines, i. e. impii inimici doctrinæ meæ, L. Brug. Joh. 15. 18, 19. Joh. 17. 14.

ſuffer moſt by, are commonly ſuch as make profeſſion of fearing and ſerving God too; unto whom light indeed is come, but they love darkneſs, and ſo they become bruiſed with *a double fall:* thus by their choice and practice, being ſuper-added to that of their nature; and whatſoever they pretend to the contrary, (as St. *Jude* ſpeaks of them) they are *twice* dead. There is no enmity like that of Brothers: our Saviour himſelf ſuffered from none ſo much as from his Friend and Diſciple *Judas*, and his followers ſince have endured moſt in all Ages from ſuch as profeſs (as well as they do) to be retainers unto him.

But I ſhall paſs this at preſent without any other Obſervation, as alſo the *ſecond part*, or the *ſtate and condition of the ſufferers* ſpoken of in my Text; only you may here of them, though briefly, in the Application.

What it is which the Diſciples of Chriſt ſuffer.

The two former branches (in my propounded method) of this firſt part being ſuch as I intend to graft my enſuing Diſcourſe upon, give me leave, though *e poſtliminio*, to come to a nearer ſearch into them; and at the firſt view, in the former of them, four remarkable particulars foretold, which the *Diſciples of Chriſt* were to *ſuffer: viz.*

Hatred.

1. *Hatred.*
2. *Separation* of them, as not worthy of Humane Society, but moſt unworthy to partake of *Church-Communion.*
3. *Reproach*, upon whom they might vomit up all their Gall without the charge and ſin of *bitterneſs.*
4. The *caſting out of their Names*, as ſuch they would ſcorn to be reckoned amongſt in *their ſervice of God.*

1. *Hatred.* This is the *root*, the bitter root of the following bitter fruits: there would be no ſeparating, no reproaching them, no caſting out of their names, were it not for the hatred they bear unto them. Now *Hatred* is a diſplicency at, and averſion from things or perſons as evil; and nothing doth make men ſeem more *hating* and *hateful* to one another, as when they act by a *contrary principle:* for ſo far at leaſt as they have ſuch a principle in them, they judge not, they affect not any thing alike, but what one calls good, the other calls evil; and what this counts evil, the former eſteems as good.

And this muſt needs be acknowledged to be true in the caſe of the Text. Chriſt's Diſciples and the Phariſees, his Church and their Perſecutors, are acted by a contrary principle; in the one is the ſeed of the Woman, in the other the ſeed of the Serpent; and where theſe meet, though in the ſame (*Rebecca*'s) Womb, they will ſtrive and ſtruggle againſt one another.

Gen. 3. 15.

Our Saviour aſſigns this as the true reaſon why the World hated him, and ſhould hate his Diſciples after him, *Joh.* 17. 14. becauſe neither he, nor they were of the World.

Now

Now this Hatred, though its seat be inward, and it be many times hidden; yet its effects are outward and obvious, none of all the passions being more active than love and hatred are; and therefore our Saviour no sooner had spoken of the Pharisees hating of his Disciples, but he presently adds, they will *separate you*, and *reproach you*.

Because I intend not so much to insist upon them, I shall speak but a word of the *Reproaches* which Christ's followers must bear from the *men* in my Text. *Hatred* being in their *heart*, 'tis no wonder that reviling is in their *lips*; for *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*; and something they must say to justifie the persecutions and mischiefs they heap upon others: for there are none (who have not put off all humanity) but would willingly have Reason and Equity on their side. 1. *Reproaches.*

Thus they taxed our *Saviour* himself that he was a *Wine-bibber*, *a Friend of Publicans and Sinners*; nay, they would not Crucifie him till they had charged him with blasphemy. Thus they calumniated the Apostles for being *filled with new Wine*, for *turning the World upside down*, and for destroying the Law, *&c.* Luke 7 34. Mark 14 64. Acts 2. 13.

Neither was it better in the immediately succeeding Ages: What did not the *Pagan-World* reproach and upbraid the Primitive Christians with? What secret and abominable wickedness did they not charge upon their private meeting together to serve God? No Epidemical Disease, or Publick Calamity befel the Empire, or any Nation in it, but it was attributed presently to some (forged) wickedness of the Christians. And it had been well if they had suffered from Pagans only: but, alas, they suffered no less from Brethren, (if I may call them Brethren) so that a Heathen could observe, That *no Beasts were so cruel one to another as Christians were.* Hunnianus. Marcellinus.

But in this last Age of the World we have the dregs of all, and the Papists act over again upon the Protestants all the Outrages which were ever heaped upon any in the forementioned instances: their calumnies against their Doctrine, their revilings of their Worship, their reproaches of their Persons, not only living, but even dead too, I could fill Volumes withal: *What shall be given unto thee, or what shall be done unto thee, O thou false tongue?* Psal. 120. 3.

But because they proceed further, so must I: They do not only shoot out their sharp arrows, but discharge their murdering-pieces at us; nay, their malice is not confined to, or satisfied with the ruine of the body, but as if it were too mean a sacrifice to their fury, they do what in them lies, (and according to their own principle they effect it) to destroy the *soul* too; for they *shall separate you*, and *cast out your Names*.

Which brings me to speak to the *other fruits* the Text mentions of the *hatred* born to *Christ's Disciples* and followers, and which this Discourse mainly intends; They shall *separate you from their company*. These latter words are added by the *Translators* to compleat (as they thought) 3. *Separation.*

thought) the sense; but it being as clear without them, I shall no farther take notice of them.

Some make the *Separation* here spoken of, to be meant only of a *Political or Civil Separation*, and their Gloss is, *In carcerem aut exilium trusserint*, they shall *banish you*, or *cast you into prison*; as if the imprisoning or banishing of them, or at least declining to trade or converse with them, were all that was intended here.

Lucas Brug. in locum.

This must be acknowledged an evil and a mischief, which they that *obey the Commandments of God*, and hold the *Faith of Jesus*, have met with, and which was foreseen by St. *John*, *Rev.* 13. 16. that *they who would not receive the mark or name of the Beast, should not buy nor sell.*

But the word here used ἀποξύνωσιν, *they shall separate*, hath a further import, and implies a *Separation from their Synagogues*, and Publick Worship, and is the same with συναγώγους ποιήσωσιν, they shall *cast you out of their Synagogues*, mentioned by St. *John*: which I the rather incline to think to be the meaning of this place, because also in the *antient Canons* the same word ἀποξυζίδω is so often repeated to this purpose, *i. e.* when they would by their Censure suspend any from Church-Communion; and then they who were thus censured, were afterwards called *abstenti*, denoting their being held off from Church-Fellowship, and the Censure its self came at length to be called, *The lesser Excommunication.*

Beza in locum Joh. 16. 2.

4. *Casting out of their Names.*

But our *Evangelist* seems to explain this best by what he adds, *They shall cast out your Names*; as 'tis said of the *blind man* who so constantly profest Christ, that they *cast him out*, Joh. 9. 34. And 'tis to be observed, that ἐκβάλωσιν, or *they shall cast out*, here in the *Prediction*, is ἐξέβαλον there, or *they did cast him out* in the fulfilling of it, the same word being made use of by either Evangelist.

As for *casting out their Names*, it refers to a known custom amongst the Jews, of keeping an exact account of all the Names of those who descended from them; not only their *Tribes* and *Families*, but every *individual person* was enrolled, as by evident places in Scripture could be readily made to appear. Now to have *their Names cast out*, or cut off from this Catalogue, was to be accounted no longer for Jews, or amongst the *then* People or Church of God, but to be reputed thenceforth as *uncircumcised*, or as one of the *Gentiles*, that is, out off the Pale of the Church, and out of the Bond of the Covenant with God. We might illustrate this from a custom which they had amongst the *Romans* too; when any were for their misdemeanours to be Disfranchized, the Censor expunged, blotted out, or cut off their Names out of the City-Rolls, and they might not after that enjoy their City-Priviledges, neither were they thenceforth to be accounted as Citizens.

The sum that this amounts unto, is, That they who would embrace, and hold fast the Faith delivered by our Saviour, should be so far from meeting with that love and respect which they ought to be entertained withal, that they should on the contrary be *Separated* and *Excommunicated*,

communicated, put out and accurſed, and that by them who ſhall take upon them to be the Governours of the Church.

That this was fulfilled in the firſt breaking forth of the Goſpel, and in the very dawning of that day, we have evident teſtimony in Scripture to prove it by; but having in part formerly mentioned it, I ſhall now only refer you to it.

This was certainly a very great Engine, by which men were not only kept off from attending unto the means of their Converſion, and cauſed to ſhut their eyes againſt the light that did ſhine ſo powerfully round about them: but in caſe it had broken in at any time unawares upon them, it was a moſt cogent Argument to keep them from owning and cherishing of it: for as St. *John* obſerves, though *many believed on him*, yet *becauſe of the Phariſees*, (who ſwayed moſt in their Sanhedrim) they *did not confeſs* him, leſt they ſhould be put out of their Church; and for this very reaſon, if *Nicodemus* will come to Jeſus, it ſhall be only *by night*. Joh. 12. 42.

Now it is a known Rule, that *Scriptura Prophetica ſæpius impletur*, one and the ſame Prophecy may reſpect divers Ages, and be fulfilled in divers times; the ſame Prediction being frequently mentioned in Scripture with an ἵνα πληρωθῇ, that *it might be fulfilled* upon divers occaſions: but I muſt not now divert to inſtances.

'Tis evident that this Prediction intimated here in my Text, is no more to be reſtrained to the Apoſtles themſelves, or the Church at that time, or immediately after, than any other foretelling of ſuffering perſecution in this World is to be, or than any promiſe of aſſiſtance and deliverance whatſoever.

It hath been realized indeed with a witneſs in our, and in our forefathers days. The *Church of Rome*, who pretend to be the only Church of God, and Spouſe of Chriſt, hath *ſeparated us from them*, and hath *caſt out our Names*; ſo that this day theſe words are fulfilled, *They ſhall ſeparate you, they ſhall caſt out your Names*.

But by reaſon that as it is not the *puniſhment*, but the *cauſe* which makes a Martyr; ſo it is not the ſuffering barely of theſe things which ſpeaks any to be the true Diſciples of Chriſt. Let us therefore enquire into the cauſes aſſigned by our Saviour in my Text for which his Diſciples ſhall be thus dealt with. And here we meet, *The cauſe of the ſuffering of Chriſt's Diſciples.*

Firſt, with a pretended cauſe, They ſhall caſt out your Names *as evil*, they ſhall faſten (as much as in them lay) all manner of calumnies upon you; and report of you, not as indeed you are, but as they who hate you would have you thought to be: they will pretend that their ſeparating of you, and not converſing, eſpecially in the Worſhip of God with you, is not what they would willingly have done, but what they were neceſſitated unto by you, who (as they alledge) have broached *new Doctrines*, and withal receded from *ancient Cuſtoms*, *&c.* 1. *The pretended cauſe.*

That this is true in either inſtance, is too apparent; the Phariſees

charged the Apoſtles, and the Church of *Rome* do charge the Proteſtants, with whatſoever they think likely to make them odious.

Some of them doubtleſs do this out of a kind of integrity of their hearts, ſeparating, excommunicating, nay killing of them, as a deſerved puniſhment for the *evil* they conceive in them, or to have been committed by them: this proceeds out of that blindneſs and ignorance which is ſo common unto all in the things of God; but eſpecially as it is further contracted or encreaſed by them, or inflicted by God upon them, for their not embracing *truth in the love of it*, or *holding it in unrighteouſneſs*: Theſe may be thought indeed to have *believed* lyes, and that they were perſwaded that they did God good ſervice in thus deſpitefully uſing thoſe that did worſhip him in ſpirit and in truth, as is intimated in a parallel place, *Joh.* 16. 2.

Rom. 1. 18, 24.

But as to others, the ſuppoſed evil in the matter that *Chriſt*'s followers are charged with, is but a *pretended* cauſe of their being ſo evilly dealt withal; not only as we ſhall ſee hereafter, in that they did not deſerve it, but becauſe alſo that they who ſo ſeverely inflict theſe Cenſures, are (at leaſt many of them) not ſo zealous againſt *any opinion*, or *practice whatſoever* as 'tis evil, that is, as it is againſt the manifeſt truth, or revealed will of God, or as it is diſhonourable to God, or deſtructive to the ſouls of men: for if they did ſet themſelves againſt any thing as *evil* indeed, they would ſet themſelves to oppoſe all evil; and in that *proportion* too in which it is evil, *a quatenus ad omne*, &c. He does not truly hate one ſin, who does not hate all ſins: as he hath no averſion from one Toad or Viper, as a Toad or Viper, who can take another up into his hands or boſom. Hatred is (as the *Philoſopher* ſays) περὶ τὸ γένος, *againſt all of a kind*, or againſt none of that kind. So that I cannot think that the *Phariſees* who were ſo notoriouſly guilty of Rapine and Extortion, and could ſwallow Widows houſes, ſhould ſtrain at the imagined falſity of the Apoſtles Doctrine, or the ſurmiſed corruption in the Goſpel-Worſhip; there being eſpecially ſuch fair footſteps for either in thoſe very Writings which they acknowledged the Rule of both. Neither can I believe that the *Church of Rome*, who can licenſe, without any regret or ſcruple, Stews and Whore-houſes, and can diſpenſe with Rebellion and Inceſt, and what not? that theſe ſhould be the men who are truly *zealous for the Truths and Worſhip of God, as ſuch*, or that they ſhould ſet themſelves ſo much againſt the Doctrine which the *Proteſtants* profeſs, or againſt the way of worſhipping of God which they uſe, becauſe they are falſe or impious, for then they would be againſt all impiety, eſpecially amongſt themſelves. But the true cauſe of the averſion of the generality of them from our opinions and practices, is, becauſe they agree not with their *Intereſts and Luſts*, and are not conſiſtent with their Profit and Grandeur: or, if you will, our *Saviour* here aſſigns the real cauſe, *viz. It is for the Son of man's ſake.*

Matth. 23. 14.

The

This is that which is at the bottom of all, *'tis for Chriſt's ſake*, for their *reſpect unto him and his Inſtitutions*, his Truths and Ordinances, that his *Diſciples* ſuffer. Would they not ſo much conſider what he hath enjoined and commanded, but follow their pretended Guides with blind obedience, they ſhould be as when *the ſtrong man armed kept the houſe*, all in peace. 2. *The real cauſe for which they ſuffer.*

In a matter ſo obvious I will not enlarge to diſcourſe concerning this deſcription of our *bleſſed Saviour* here uſed, *Son of man*; 'tis known to be one of the Names or Titles which he was pleaſed to denote or deſcribe himſelf by; who, though he was *God bleſſed for ever*, vouchſafed to take upon him our nature, and to become man for us: thus condeſcending to us both in the *name and thing*, that we might know that it was he in whom that Prophecy was fulfilled, *Unto us a Child is born*, *unto us a Son is given*, &c. And by this means he did in the higheſt manner recommend himſelf, and *Truths*, his *Will and Worſhip unto us*. It is *for his ſake*, i. e. for their *love and faithfulneſs*, their reſpect and obedience unto him, that they who believe truly in him in all Ages do ſuffer. Would but the *Apoſtles* have forborn to *preach in his Name*; would they have obſerved the antient, but antiquated Rites of the *Jewiſh Church*, they might long enough have kept in amongſt them, and ſhould not have been perſecuted by them: So would the *Proteſtants* not regard the mind and will of God, nor the Doctrine and Inſtitutions of Chriſt, but let the *Church of Rome* add or take away at its pleaſure, they ſhould not have been, nor now need they be, *caſt out* by them. Eſay 9. 6.

This is that which I ſhall more ſtrictly confine my ſelf unto, though all along I have intended to lay a Foundation with ſuch *Materials* as might ſuit the intended Structure.

The *Church of Rome* charge the *Proteſtants* with *Schiſm*, as rending and dividing themſelves from the true Church, which, as they tell us, they themſelves only are.

I ſhall paſs by all the other reproaches they lade us with, though very heinous and innumerable; it being a common matter with them (as with the Pagan Perſecutors of old) to put the ſincere *Profeſſors* of the Truths of God into Beaſts Skins, allowing them to have ſcarce a humane ſhape, that any who would might the more eagerly bait and worry them to death.

But as for their imputation of *Schiſm* unto us, we may well aver, that *of all men* they have leaſt reaſon to charge us with it upon divers accounts, but eſpecially becauſe *they themſelves* have put us from them: they have *ſeparated us*, and *caſt out our Names*, and to this day theſe words in my Text are verified concerning us. And is it not hard to be accuſed for going from them, who put us away, and caſt us from them by force? But they ſerve us as they did the *Waldenſes*, whom they plundered, robb'd, and ſtripped of all they had, and then by way of deriſion and contempt called them *Pauperes Lugdunenſes*, The poor men of *Lyons*,

about which City those famous Professors of the Truth were formerly most numerous.

I suppose that the matter of fact cannot be doubted of, and that none will question whether the *Protestants* have been, or are thus dealt withal by the *Church of Rome*; for I might bring a whole Cloud of Witnesses to prove it. All the *Martyrs* who have suffered any ways under them, are, in their ordinary course of proceedings, *cast out*, and *Excommunicated* by that Church, before they are delivered over to the Civil Magistrate to be condemned and executed; and such as they cannot get into their hands, or where by the favour of Laws, or tenderness of Princes, the *Inquisition* cannot obtain, the *Council of Trent anathematize and curses* howsoever. And the Bull *de Cœna Domini* goes farther, for in that the *Pope* not only Excommunicates all who in the way which they call Heresie, worship the God of their Fathers, but he accurses all them too, who do *any ways favour them*, though *it be but by giving civil respect, or a necessary alms unto them*; so extensive is their Charity. Little reason have we then to expect that which they so much boast of, Good Works from them.

To pass by their exquisite torments, and more than barbarous cruelties exercised upon the bodies of Christians, (whilst they willingly suffer Jews in many places to dwell quietly amongst them) so directly contrary to the so much gloried in Primitive Church, who could not endure those Bishops who perswaded the Emperour to put Hereticks to death: and to be sure vastly differing from the mind and spirit of the meek *JESUS*, who would not at the instance of his Disciples destroy *the truly both Heretical and Schismatical Samaritans* by fire, though otherwise too he was inhumanly treated by them.

There may seem something to be pleaded for their Church-Censures, as if they were but the cutting off gangrenated and dead Members for the better preserving of the rest of the body. And as if they did this too in obedience to that Apostolical Precept of delivering *such unto Satan*, and so putting away *evil from amongst them*. But what is this to their *interdicting* of whole Kingdoms, in which there cannot be supposed fewer *thousands* (and they full out as innocent as any in *Nineveh*) not *knowing their right hand from their left*. By which Interdicts (according to their own Authors) all Divine *Offices* and Service of what kind soever was forbidden throughout the whole interdicted Territory. None might preach or pray, or administer the Sacraments amongst them, whilst the Interdict lasted; the whole Region being by it put out (as they termed it) of the Communion of the Church, and all that died therein, during that space, how long soever, believed by them damn'd for ever. This (not to mention its effects in other places) lasted in *England*, as *Matthew Paris* records, in King *John*'s time, six years and an half, in which space it is thought there died in this Land above six hundred thousand men, women and children: And must all these necessarily eternally perish,

1 Cor 5.5,13.

Emanuel Sa Aphorismis in turbo Interdictum.

periſh, becauſe that the King and Pope were at variance with one another? with which matter the poor Commons had little to do, neither could they intermeddle without rebelling againſt their Sovereign.

And what does the caſting out of the *inceſtuous* perſon, or the holding of an *obſtinate* ſinner as an *Heathen or Publican*, make for the ſecluding ſo many millions of *Proteſtants* from their Church, and putting of them by that means (at leaſt as they ſurmiſe) into a ſtate of inevitable perdition?

Eſpecially when as the *Proteſtants* with one conſent do believe all things which are written in the Law and in the Prophets, which St. *Paul* thought a ſufficient *Apology* for himſelf, when he *could not receive the Traditions of the Elders:* they believe no leſs, all that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts have declared; they willingly embrace the three antient Creeds, accounted by the Primitive Church ſufficient Teſts of approved Chriſtianity: they deſire to live in all good Conſcience towards God and men; and to give to every one their due in the place into which God hath put them. Acts 24. 14.

Neither can we reaſonably be charged with obſtinacy, being very deſirous to be informed better in any thing in which through miſtake as men we might have erred. We pray to God daily that he would enlighten us, and give us to ſee the *marvellous things in his Word.* We deſire to be thankful unto men, who God is pleaſed at any time to make inſtrumental for our further information in any of his Truths, or our Duties. Now 'tis *Obſtinacy* only which is *the dead fleſh of Hereſie or Schiſm*, and makes that *Gangrene* incurable, and the part affected with it to be ſawn off, and contentedly parted withal.

But yet for all this we are not *Scepticks* neither; we know whom and what we believe; and we reſolve, by the Grace of God, to continue in it: and if they call our *Conſtancy*, *Obſtinacy*, may they call it ſo ſtill, rather than that we ſhould depart from it. We ſhould be loath to pin our Faith upon any mans ſleeve, be he Pope, or who he will. If St. *Paul* himſelf, or an *Angel from Heaven preach any other Goſpel unto us, than that which we have received, he is, and muſt be accurſed*; a ſufficient caveat, one would think, againſt ſwallowing at all adventures whatſoever may be recommended to us upon the bare Topick of Authority, and not enquiring into the merit of the cauſe, the nature of the thing propounded, whether right or wrong, true or falſe. Henceforth an *Ipſe Dixit*, ſuch an one ſaid ſo, or ſuch *a Pope defin'd* it thus, will be but a pitiful excuſe at the Day of Judgment for any falſe way. I muſt forbear touching more upon this ſtring at preſent, being willing to join *Iſſue about our being parted from the Church of* Rome, from the cauſe aſſigned in my Text, *viz. The Son of Man's ſake.* Gal. 1. 8.

Which words I ſhall conſider with a more particular relation to the ſeveral matters in Controverſie betwixt us and them; and it may be reaſonably hoped, that if we have *Chriſt*'s Cauſe and Honour on our ſide

in those very things for which they *separate* us, and *cast out our Names*, we may be reckoned still amongst his *Disciples*; and the *Church of Rome* as well as the *Jewish Church*, may justly be reputed amongst the Persecutors here foretold of.

And this we may deduce from the following Scheme.

1. It is for the Truths of Christ; the Doctrine own'd, preach'd, and recommended by him, that they thus deal with us.

2. It is for the Purity of his Worship, because we would serve God according to his own Will, and not according to their Will-worship, that they thus abhor us.

3. It is for his Authorities sake, because we dare not take the Government from off his Shoulders; nor pay that respect to any frail man, which is only due unto him who is God blessed for evermore: or if you will, it is because we dare not worship the Beast, that they serve us thus.

To sum up all in one; it is for the Vindication of Christ in all his Offices, that we endure these Indignities at their hands.

1. *The Protestants are separated for Christ's Truths sake.*

The difference between *us* and the *Church of Rome* is most important in *Matters of Faith*; it is indeed such, and so great, that we willingly acknowledge, as they *separate us* for not being of *their* mind, so we are most willing not only to be parted, but *to part* from them, for their not being of *God's mind*: for *what fellowship can light have with darkness? or what Communion hath Christ with Belial?* 2 Cor. 6. 14, 15.

'Tis true on our part, that we would not for every *mis-perswasion* in the things of Religion, part with any ones Communion: as every man hath a soul of his own, so he cannot but through common frailty, different measures and means of knowledge, have conceits and opinions different from others about almost any subject. And though every truth is worth the embracing, yet betwixt Truths themselves there is as great a difference as there is between Farthings and Guineys; which, though they be both Coins, yet are of a very disproportioned value.

There are by the confession of all some *Fundamental Truths*, and by consequence there must be some *Fundamental Errours*. It is a *Metaphorical Epithite*, taken from Buildings, for as Buildings cannot stand if the Foundation be removed or taken away; so the Church, which is
1 Tim. 3. 15. called the House of God, cannot stand neither if it be removed from those saving Truths, upon which; as upon a Rock, Christ hath founded
Titus 3. 10. it. And therefore the Apostle, who so earnestly blames the judging and condemning one another in lesser matters, yet would have us to reject such an Heretick, (after the first and second admonition) who holds any thing contrary unto these.

Now we cannot be justly charged by the *Church of Rome* with any *positive* Errour that can so much as strike at the Foundation: nay, she believes what we believe concerning *God*; *one in Essence, three in Persons*: She acknowledges with us the *Person, Natures, Suffering, Resurrection*

and

and Aſcenſion of Chriſt, and all the other *Articles of the Creed.* She charges us only with *Negatives*, becauſe we cannot admit all ſuch Doctrines as ſhe injuriouſly obtrudes upon us as matter of Faith: this is indeed the Apple of Contention betwixt us; and becauſe we dare not allow and approve of every *Dictate of the Pope*, or *Definition* of the now *Roman Church* as an *Oracle of God*, we ſtand accurſed by them. *Biſhop Hall's Peace-maker.*

To point at ſome few *inſtances* in ſtead of many.

Do we believe that the *Scriptures are a Rule for Life and Manners?* ſo do *they:* but what they give with the one hand, they take away with the other; in that they make *Traditions*, and the *Determinations of their Church*, neceſſary to be received with the ſame reverence that Scripture is to be received withal: ſo that Scripture, which in word they dare not deny to be the *Rule*, in deed they make it nothing leſs, defaming it what they can, as *ſhort*, *imperfect*, *and obſcure*; nay, forbidding the *reading*, *or having of it in a vulgar Tongue*, where they may. Whereas we may well aver, that no *Art or Science* whatſoever was ſo fully and *plainly taught* by any Book in the whole World, as our *Chriſtian-calling*, and the *true art of living and dying in the Faith of Chriſt*, *and in the favour of God*, *is taught us in his Word*; the ἀκρόαματα, or things in it that are hard to be underſtood, being matters of leſs import to the welfare of our ſouls. As for thoſe Truths whereby Life and Immortality is brought to light, there need not ſo much Gloſſes and Commentaries to underſtand them by, as to bring an humble and teachable mind unto them. 1. *Concerning the Scripture.*

We believe that our Saviour *Chriſt* is the *Mediator betwixt God and man:* they ſay that they believe the ſame too; and becauſe Scripture is ſo expreſs concerning it, they dare not deny but that he is the only Mediator: for the Apoſtle ſays as well that there is but one Mediator, as he ſays that there is but one God, and Jeſus, theſe two indiſſolvably together. And yet for all this the *Church of Rome* can give away Chriſt's Mediators place with a nice diſtinction at one blow, aſſigning new Advocates unto us, as often as they pleaſe to canonize any. And leſt it ſhould be too much for our bleſſed Saviour to be our Mediator by his Redemption, (which for good manners in the known diſtinction they leave unto him) they have ſet up another *Propitiatory Sacrifice* beſides that at his Paſſion, which their *Prieſts do offer every day for the living and for the dead:* Nay, they will not let *his Blood purifie us from our ſins*, but have found out a Purgatory, in which our ſouls muſt be purged by their own ſufferings after death. 2. *Concerning the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt.* 1 Tim. 2. 5. Revel. 1. 5.

We ſay with the Apoſtle, that we are *ſaved by Grace*, Epheſ. 2. 8. which the Papiſts will not deny in down-right terms, but they will add ſomething to it, which ſhall make this *Grace to be no Grace* before that they have done; either interpoſing the *prævision* of our good works without Grace in the purpoſe of God before the World began, or ſome *good diſpoſition* in us, exciting God to beſtow his Grace upon us: which 3. *Concerning Grace.*

Grace

Grace being well improved by us, meriteth no leſs than Glory at his hands for us. Whoſoever liſts to ſearch this to the quick, will find, that there was never a prouder Opinion held by any of the children of men than this is; hence flow not their *ſatisfactory works* only, by which they pay ſufficiently unto God whatſoever is owing unto his Juſtice by them; but they hold alſo works of *Supererogation*, whereby they deſerve more than they need for themſelves, or know well what to do with, and therefore they put it into the Treaſury of the Church, for the avail of thoſe who by *Money and Maſſes* can take it out. The *Phariſee* was modeſt who ſaid in the heighth of his boaſting, *Lord, I thank thee:* if any of them would ſpeak this opinion out, he would ſay, *Lord, thou mayſt thank me.*

Luke 18. 11.

I will paſs by multitudes of inſtances of the like nature, and will content my ſelf only with theſe, as being ſuch as I judged moſt material; and ſuch, as reſpect the very *Foundation*; and therefore their Errours concerning them muſt of neceſſity be of very bad conſequence. For,

These truths are fundamental.

1. *Scripture is the Foundation of the Doctrine of Salvation*, and the Church is ſaid in this reſpect to be built upon the *Foundation* of the Prophets and Apoſtles, *Epheſ.* 2. 20. that is, the Church is built upon the *Doctrine* which was delivered by the Apoſtles and Prophets; a good Parallel to underſtand that ſo much controverted ſaying of our Saviour by, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*, to be meant of Chriſt's building his Church upon the Doctrine, and not upon the Perſon or Succeſſors of St. *Peter*.

Matth. 16. 18.

2. *Our Saviour Chriſt is the Foundation of our Salvation its ſelf*, in that he purchaſed it by his death, and prepares and preſerves it by his life; in which reſpect the Apoſtle tells us, that none can lay any other *Foundation than that which is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 Corinth. 3. 11.

3. Grace is the *Foundation of the Application of this Salvation*, in that all the benefits which *Chriſt* hath purchaſed for us, and all the works which anſwerably thereunto he works by his Spirit within us, are all *founded upon Grace*, upon which only they depend, the hearts of believers being hence ſaid to be *eſtabliſhed by Grace*, Heb. 13. 9.

Now if they undermine or take away theſe *Foundation-Truths* from us, let them take all: 'tis howſoever obſervable that the *Proteſtants* Opinions in theſe caſes muſt needs be *ſafe:* for ſurely neither the *Word of God, nor the Son of God, nor the Grace of God*, can be reaſonably challenged with any *inſufficiency*, that they ſhould need the Additions and Inventions of men to make them ſucceſsful, in that eſpecially which they are choſen, and appointed unto by God. If God thought his Word to be ſufficient to enlighten us, his Son to redeem and intercede for us, his Grace ſufficient to ſanctifie and keep us unto Salvation, we are content with his choice and allotment, and do not envy others who pretend to

have

have more: but it is to be feared that they who graſp at more, do loſe all. And we would rather have our Names caſt out by them, for not adding to the Word of God, than that for our additions unto it, *God ſhould add unto us the plagues that are written in it.* Rev. 22. 19.

Neither may we be ſo much taken with the *Truths* which in theſe and other particulars the *Church of Rome* do retain, as that for their ſake we ſhould ſwallow the Errours which they mix with thoſe Verities; and that rather than to be *ſeparated from their Communion*, we might ſubſcribe or aſſent to all the other Articles that are propoſed by them; that were *to do evil that good might come of it.* Beſides, this retaining of ſome Truths, do ſtand them in good ſtead to put off many Errours the better by. Few could vend defective Wares, if they did not ſhew ſome that were true made together with them. We know that falſe or counterfeit Money will hardly go off alone; neither is Poyſon ordinarily taken ſingly, or by its ſelf, but mixed with wholſom Food; and by that means it deceives the ſooner, and ſpreads the farther.

Were there then nothing but this, that we muſt believe all that is determined, or that ſhall be determined by the *Church of Rome*, (for they have lately made, and may ſtill make new Articles of Faith) or elſe we muſt be accurſed by them; we are rather to undergo all their *Separations* and *Excommunications*, than to aſſent to untruths, or ſeem to believe lyes. Whoſoever they be that propoſe any thing to be believed by us, we may juſtly expect that they ſhould prove one of theſe two things unto us. Either

Two things neceſſary to be proved before we can believe ought that is propoſed.

1. That *the Article propoſed by them to be believed is part of the Faith once delivered unto the Saints:* Or

2. That *there may be now a new Faith.*

The former of theſe, as to the points in controverſie, they will never be able to prove; and that makes them ſpeak ſo ſlightly of Scripture, becauſe they know it is not for their turn: beſides, if that we muſt *contend* for the Faith that was then delivered, we muſt contend againſt the Traditions, and all the ſuper-added Definitions of their Church, ſo far at leaſt as they are contrary unto it, and reduce all again to the old Teſt of the *Law and the Teſtimony*; which we would gladly do, but that they dare not abide by, but call out to the Fathers and Councils, though in vain, for help.

1. *That it was once delivered to the Saints.*

As for the latter, *viz. The making of a new Faith.* Whoſoever makes a new *Faith*, muſt make a new *Hope* for us too; and from them that propound another way unto us, we may expect another Heaven for us; for God's Heaven muſt be attained in God's way. Yet this new Faith was attempted to be made and propounded by ſome of them; witneſs the *Evangelium æternum* which the Fryars made, and the Pope favoured. In which new Goſpel they affirmed that the *Goſpel of Chriſt* was not the *Goſpel of the Kingdom*, and that the *Old* and *New Teſtament*

2. *Or that we may have a new Faith.*

had loſt their force, or ſhould ſoon loſe it: the time they ſet is now expired above four hundred years ſince.

But this device not ſucceeding, they have ſince been more reſerved and cunning: Not down-right and all at once, but indirectly and by degrees endeavouring to bring us to this their purpoſe; on the one hand decrying Scripture and revealed Truths as much as they can, and on the other hand magnifying as much thoſe things, whoſe truth and goodneſs (if they have any) are only derived from *their Churches Recommendation.* One paſſage of *Cardinal Hoſius* muſt not be forgot, who affirmed, That were it not for the *Churches Authority* interpoſed in the caſe, *Scripture* were no better than *Æſops Fables.* Gen. 49. 6. *O my ſoul, come not thou into their ſecret: and unto their aſſembly mine honour be not thou united.*

2. *We are ſeparated for Chriſt's inſtituted Worſhips ſake.* Joh. 4. 24.

The difference between the Proteſtant and now *Roman* Church is as conſiderable about Religious Worſhip. They *ſeparate us*, and *caſt out our Names*, becauſe we deſire to keep to the purity and ſimplicity of Worſhip, ſo often commanded by God, and ſo highly recommended by Chriſt; and they on the other ſide do add in matters of Divine Worſhip according to the inventions of their own hearts, and the humours of every fanciful Pope.

Now this we are the more careful about, becauſe that they who worſhip any thing beſides the true God, or who worſhip him any other way than according to his own appointment, are in the ſecond Commandment declared by God to be *Haters of him, i. e.* in a more eminent manner than any other ſinners whoſoever. We find alſo Will-worſhip to be ſuch a Leaven, as that (where it is join'd with otherwiſe right and well-directed Devotion) it leavens the whole lump, and makes the whole but one continued provocation in God's account. Zeph. 3. 5. Thoſe that *ſwear by the Lord and by Malcham*, are eſteemed as if they had not ſworn by God at all, but by *Malcham* only. As wicked as *Ahaz* is recorded to be, he is not charged for not retaining the Altar of 2 King. 16. 18. the Lord, but for bringing another *Altar from Damaſcus*, and placing of it by God's Altar at the Temple of *Jeruſalem.*

One would think that *waſhing of hands*, and the *wearing of broad Phylacteries*, were matters ſo indifferent, as that they could not be diſpleaſing unto God; eſpecially when *commanded by the Church*, and recommended too by *Tradition:* yet our Saviour aſſures us (though they Matth. 15. 9. thought to pleaſe God the better by them) it made all the reſt of the Phariſees Worſhip but vain and unacceptable.

Jerem. 3. 14. Worſhip is indeed the *Marriage-Duty* which the Church of God is to pay unto none but unto him, who is married unto her; and God hath declared himſelf to be a *Jealous God*, and that he will not permit any Creature to partake that Marriage-rite together with him. Hence it Ezek. 23. 30. is that Idolatry is ſo often called Adultery, and a going a whoring from God; and in this, amongſt other things, to be ſure they agree: that as

as amongſt men for every fault, though heinous ones too, there cannot be a ſeparation between man and wife, but for Adultery there may; ſo God is pleaſed not to give a Bill of Divorce to any Church or People for any ſin ſo much as for Idolatry. When once they become over-ſpread with that ſin, then it is that God ſays unto them, *Lo-ammi, Ye are not my people*, Hoſ. 1.9.

If we muſt then either be bidden by the *Church of Rome* to depart from her for not worſhipping what ſhe pleaſes, and as ſhe liſts, or that God ſhould depart from us, (by the with-drawing of his Word and Spirit from us) and bid us to depart from him, becauſe we did not worſhip him according to his preſcribed Will, (but preferred man's will before his will) it is eaſie to determine which we ſhould moſt dread, and labour to avoid. Nay, let them again and again bid us to depart from them here, that God may not bid us to depart from him hereafter. Their *Cenſure of Excommunication* is lighter than the ſmall duſt in the balance, if compared with his *Sentence of Condemnation*.

I know that this *Harlot*, with the adulterous woman in the *Proverbs*, Chap. 30. 20. *wipeth her mouth, and ſaith, I have done no wickedneſs.* Yet I ſhall take it for granted, that if ſhe gives and requires Religious or Divine Worſhip to be given to any Creature, ſhe is guilty of Idolatry, or elſe there is no ſuch thing as Idolatry in the world: this being confeſſedly the worſt kind of falſe Worſhip, and that for which God gave the Heathens over unto ſuch *ſtrong deluſions, and vile affections*, Rom. 1. 25, 26. Aquin. 2. ſecundæ queſt. 94. Artic. 3.

I ſhall not inſiſt upon the particulars of Divine Worſhip; which is either *internal*, the worſhip of the heart; or *external*, the worſhip of the body. *Faith and Hope* are the homage which the heart pays unto God. It believes in him, as true and faithful; and hopes in him, as good and gratious in the higheſt degree. *Adoration and Service* are the tribute which the body owes unto God. Now I could eaſily evince that the Church of *Rome* gives any, or all of theſe to Creatures: for whilſt they pray to Saints, (whether real or imaginary ones) they muſt hope and believe in them; for *how can they call upon them in whom they have not believed?* Rom. 10 14. And whilſt they proſtrate themſelves before their very Images, whilſt they build *Altars* and *Churches*, and keep *Feſtivals, or obſerve days* unto them, they give them whatſoever the outward man is able to perform to God himſelf.

Yet all this Worſhip they think that calling of it by another name (δουλία) they can juſtifie.

Not to inſiſt upon that which hath been ſo often proved by others, that the words δουλία and λατρία are promiſcuouſly uſed, and that if there be any difference δουλία imports the more ſervile offices of the two. Alas! the common people break the *Cobweb-thred of ſuch nice diſtinctions*, which they are not able to skill of; and, as ſome amongſt themſelves have feared, fall into down-right Idolatry.

Not daring to give Divine Worſhip,

But not the ſelf, or that worſhip which they acknowledge to be Divine, and of the higheſt kind which can be given to God himſelf: yet,

1. To the Croſs. Aquin. p. 3. queſt. 25. Art. 4 Bonavent. 3. Sent. diſt. 9. q. 4.

1. They give it to the *Croſs*, as *Aquinas and Bonaventure* (who are Sainted amongſt them) and a many others, do affirm. And *Aquinas* proves that the Croſs may be adored with Divine Adoration, becauſe they put the hope of their Salvation in it: and to that purpoſe he cites an Hymn of that Church, wherein it calls the Croſs, Its only hope.

Not to ſpeak of Croſſes as they are painted or carved, unto which alſo they give the ſame honour: though it is more than probable that as they are uſually made, they do not ſo much as reſemble the Croſs upon which Chriſt ſuffered.

But granting that the true Croſs upon which Chriſt ſuffered may be worſhipped, (which yet we abhor to grant) may they not be miſtaken in the Wood of that Croſs? It is certain there is more Wood worſhipped for the Wood of the Croſs, than *Simon of Cyrene* (or their Giant-like *Saint Chriſtopher*) could ever bear. And in ſuch a caſe when they worſhip a piece of ordinary Wood, (and perhaps without its due figure to inhance it) themſelves muſt grant that they are Idolaters. But ſuppoſing that they be not miſtaken, it is a wonder that they ſhould have ſuch a Veneration for the Croſs, and Spears, and Nails by which Chriſt ſuffered, whilſt that all Chriſtians have the other Inſtruments of his ſuffering (as *Judas* and *Pilate* are) deſervedly in ſo great an Execration.

2. To the Hoſt. 2. They adore the *Hoſt*, that is, *the conſecrated bread in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, and that with *a Divine Worſhip*, the very ſame which they would give to God, or Chriſt himſelf. And the *Council of Trent* do accurſe all that think this ought not to be done, and that the Sacrament ought not thus to be worſhipped. It is ſtrange what they ſay, that a Prieſt ſhould make his Maker; but it is ſtranger yet, that as ſoon as he is made by him, he ſhould fall down immediately and worſhip the workmanſhip of his own hands: which made *Averroes* ſay, that he never ſaw ſo *fooliſh* a Sect of Religion as the *Chriſtians* were, who with *their teeth devoured the God they had adored.* So that to excuſe themſelves from being Idolaters, the beſt plea they do uſe proves them worſe than *Canibals:* for theſe devour but men like themſelves: the Papiſts, if we believe this their excuſe, do *devour the fleſh of the Son of God.*

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 13. Cap. 5.

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 7.

It is not my intention to ſpeak unto that monſtrous and truly ſenceleſs opinion of *Tranſubſtantiation:* but ſuppoſing of it to be true, yet the *Church of Rome*, holding the *intention of the Miniſter to be neceſſary towards the efficacy of every Sacrament*; (and by conſequence that unleſs the Prieſt whilſt he ſpeaks thoſe five tranſubſtantiating words, *Hoc enim eſt corpus meum*, do intend by them to change the Bread into the Body

of

of Chriſt, &c. that then there is no change wrought by them:) what a miſerable danger of Idolatry muſt all the people be in, in the mean while? They certainly cannot tell the mind of the Prieſt; and if he be not intent, as too often they are not, upon that buſineſs, all that worſhip that *Hoſt* muſt be moſt groſs Idolaters, were all the opinions of their Leaders granted them to be true.

3. The laſt *inſtance* that I will give of their Idolatry, ſhall be in their worſhipping of the *Virgin Mary*: they call this worſhip which they give unto her ὑπερδουλία, and they make it a middle ſort betwixt the other two formerly mentioned: but they might call it, if that they pleaſed, ὑπερλατρία; for they ſay unto her, and attribute unto her more than unto Chriſt himſelf. Nay, they *Petition her to command her Son by her Motherly Authority*; little conſidering that ſhe her ſelf called him *God her Saviour*, though according to the fleſh he was her Son. 3. *To the Virgin* Mary. Luke 1.47.

Now though this, and much more which might be ſaid, do very plainly prove that their worſhip hath got the *Plague-ſpot of Idolatry* upon it, and therefore that it is by no means to be meddled withal; yet they are ſo devoted unto it, as that they have commanded all ſuch paſſages to be left out in the Editions of the Fathers, which ſpeak for Adoration as due, or to be given only unto God. Nay, the very *ſecond Commandment* hath not eſcaped them, but they have put it out of the number of the Commandments, that they of their Communion might not be ſelf-condemned when they reflect upon it. Index Expurg. Madriti, Anno 1612.

I know that ſome amongſt them do ſew other fig-leaves together to hide this their nakedneſs, but in vain: for how can there be a *ſubaltern, or ſubordinate Religious Worſhip*, unleſs there be a *ſubordinate* Deity too? There are, and ought to be degrees of Civil Reſpects, which are given diverſly unto men, according to the various degrees of Worth or Authority in the Objects, unto whom they are paid: but the Honour or Worſhip of God, and whatſoever is due unto him *as God*, can no more be ſhared by the Creature, than his *infinite Eſſence and Majeſty* from which it flows. Neither will it ſerve their turn that they ſay they do not worſhip his Image with the ſame mind and affection wherewith they worſhip himſelf; no more than if an *Adultereſs* ſhould plead that though ſhe proſtitutes her body unto others, yet ſhe does it not with the ſame degree of affection wherewith ſhe embraces her Husband only. *Gregory de Valens* makes the hardeſt ſhift of them all to excuſe this ſin, by ſaying, that there is a *lawful* as well as an unlawful Idolatry. And acknowledging that they do uſe the former: we ſhall take his Confeſſion that they are Idolaters: but neither he, nor any other can ever prove ſuch a contradiction *(in adjecto)* as a lawful Idolatry. Well may they hold Concupiſcence to be no ſin, who hold any Idolatry to be lawful. Libro 2. de Idol. Cap. 7.

We can meet with no ſuch *Diſtinctions*, nor ground for them neither in all the Word of God: but this we find there, that there is no *agree-* 2 Cor. 6. 16, 17.

ment

ment betwixt the Temple of God and Idols: and that where Idolatry is, we are bidden to depart, and to be separate, whether we might be retained or no. Whatsoever then we do or suffer in this cause, it is for the *Son of Man's sake*; who himself taught us to answer all Objections, and to repel all temptations unto this sin, by alledging, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Matth. 4. 10. and by his beloved Disciple hath bidden us *to keep our selves from Idols*, 1 *Joh.* 5. *ult.*

3. *It is for Christ's Sovereignty's sake that we are separated.*

It is for Christ's *Authority and Sovereignty's sake* that we are *separated*, and *have our Names cast out* by the Church of *Rome*. Would we but magnifie their usurped power, we might swear, curse and blaspheme, commit Whordom and Incest, and what not? and yet be accounted true Sons of their Church. Had St. *Paul* but cryed up their great *Diana*, the *Ephesians* had not been offended with him; had he been otherwise as vicious as he was virtuous, or as prophane as he was holy.

We are willing for to obey them that *have the rule over us in the Lord*: but still so as that we may keep and maintain our fealty intire unto him who is over all. We are ready to submit to Governours *under him* in Church and State: but we must remember that we and they too are *under him*. The Legislative and Soverign Power is incommunicably in Christ, and cannot be parted withal by him. Who should give Laws to bind our inward man, but he that can *search and try it*, and can take cognizance of the performance or breach of his Law by it, and can punish or reward as he finds cause?

Neither does the *Infallibility* which the *Church of Rome* assumes, less derogate from the honour which is due unto Christ, it being a *Jewel of his Crown*. I shall not enquire where the now *Roman Church* do make the *subject* of this Infallibility, (for they are not agreed upon it amongst themselves) whether it recides in the Pope, or in a General Council; or if the Pope be infallible, whether he be so in matters of Faith, or in matters of Right only. We deny either, to one or to all of them.

Fallibility cannot be removed out of the mind, no more than Mortality from the body of any. They go *æquis passibus*, and are both fixed to that state which all men are born in, and they cannot put either of them off, no more than Humanity it self. Nay, could there be an *Universal*, or truly *Oecumenical Council*, which there never was since the Apostles times; yet every Member of that Council being but fallible, the Council it self could not be infallible. Not to mention any particulars, which might be instanced in, which though determined by Councils and Popes, yet are antiquated, and rejected by the Papists themselves.

'Tis obvious that *one Pope* hath frequently contradicted another, and one Council hath thwarted the other; and surely they were not on both sides in the right. How much safer is it to obey *God's beloved Son*, who being the express Image of the Father, is *Truth it self*, and whom we are bidden for to hear? it being the Character of a true Sheep of Christ's

Chriſt's Fold that he will hear his voice, and not the voice of ſtrangers. Joh. 10. 3, 5.

In obedience then *unto Chriſt* it is that we dare not thus become *ſervants unto men.* Though we may *go and come*, we may not believe and diſ-believe as they pleaſe: Nay, we cannot do it if that we would: For the *Will* hath no ſuch power over the *Underſtanding*, as to make it think or believe what it liſts to be true or falſe. The Will can ſet the Underſtanding upon acting on what Object it pleaſes, but it cannot make the Underſtanding concerning any Object think what it pleaſeth, its power over it being only *quoad exercitium*, and not *quoad ſpecificationem.*

Now this makes the Government of the *Romiſh Church* to be the moſt inſupportable tyranny that the World hath ever known. Other Tyrants have been content with their Domination over their Vaſſals Bodies and Eſtates: nothing will ſatisfie theſe but to domineer over the *Souls of men* too; and we meet with the *ſouls of men reckoned amongſt their Merchandize*, Rev. 18. 13. And well may they ſo be: for the greateſt Traffick amongſt them is for mens Souls.

And whereas God declares that he gives us *his Commandments for our good always*, though he hath an indiſputable and uncontroulable right over us, yet he commands us nothing barely that he might exerciſe his Domination and abſolute power that belongs unto him: but all his Inſtitutions and appointments are ſuch, as in their own nature would be advantageous to us, were they not enjoined by him; there being nothing that accompliſhes and perfects man more than Holineſs and the Image of God; which his Injunctions (in every inſtance) do tend only to promote. Deut. 6. 24.

But alas! what are men the better for multitudes of Obſervations injoined amongſt the *Romaniſts?* They themſelves cannot ſay that there is any goodneſs in them, but only what they derive from the *Authority that enjoins them:* And if that Authority ſhould forbid them, or command other things contrary unto, or at leaſt divers from them, they would then be reputed of *another* nature by ſuch who contend ſo eagerly for them: though we have reaſon to believe that they *call good, evil; and evil, good*; yet that they can *make* evil to be good, or good to be evil, is incredible unto us.

Yet theſe pitiful little things, which they can make for good or bad at their pleaſure, they are more earneſt in, than for all the great things in the Law. Tranſgreſſions againſt the Law of God written in our very hearts and natures, and tranſcribed thence into our *Bibles*, meet with little or no cenſure amongſt them: but to doubt of any of their *Churches Definitions*, or to diſobey any of her Commands, (in thoſe things which never came into God's heart to enjoin) is amongſt them a moſt unpardonable ſin. So that as men have been obſerved to love their Books (being the Iſſue of their Brain and Studies) more than their Children,

Children, the fruit of their Bodies: theſe men dote upon their own inventions and imaginations, more than upon any thing, though by God himſelf recommended unto them.

And as it ordinarily happens, the miſery of the people is attended by
1 Cor.9.22. the *iniquity of their Leaders:* for is this to become *all things unto all men*, to make their Flock become whatſoever they pleaſe unto them? Is this
2 Cor.10.8. to exerciſe their power (according to their Commiſſion) *for Edification?* Does it not *impeach the Wiſdom of God*, and the Faithfulneſs of Chriſt, to make more things neceſſary to be believed and practiſed than were commanded us in the Word, or told unto us by the Son of God? Is it not *againſt the Rule of Charity*, (that Bond of Perfection) to lay ſuch heavy yoaks upon others, as they would not have, were they Diſſenters, impoſed upon themſelves? Does it not occaſion *Diſſimulation and Hypocriſie* in men (and there is ſin enough every where) to require of thoſe in Communion with them, to affirm or deny, to practiſe or forbear in the things of God, every thing according to the humour of their preſent Rulers, and eſpecially upon ſuch ſevere penalties? For-
Rom. 10.9. merly whoſoever confeſs'd *with their mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believed in their hearts that God had raiſed him from the dead, might be ſaved:* And though this was ſomewhat enlarged in the *Creed*, (commonly called the *Apoſtles Creed*) what is that to ſo many Volumes of Decrees and Councils (the late ones eſpecially of their own contriving) which the Church of *Rome* enforces a ſubmiſſion unto?

2 Cor.11.28. *St. Paul*, who had *the care of all the Churches upon him*, eſpecially he
Gal.2.7,8. had *the Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion committed unto him*, (ſo that it is a wonder the Popes have not claimed to be his Succeſſors, it is more for their purpoſe than to be St. *Peter*'s, whoſe line was amongſt them of the Circumciſion) this bleſſed *Paul* having undoubted Apoſtolick Author-
Rom.14.3. rity, would not preſcribe to the Church of *Rome*, whether all *ſhould obſerve a day or no*, or whether they ſhould *all eat fleſh or no*, though no pretenſions of *Uniformity* would be wanting on the one ſide or on the other. Nay, he was ſo far from oppoſing any unneceſſary burden, that
Gal.5.1. he commands his *Galatians* to *ſtand faſt in their liberty.* Were there more of his ſpirit in the world, we might have leſs ſhew, but more ſubſtance in Religion.

It is a *ſorry comfort that is left us*, that notwithſtanding the Churches Commands, we may think the things commanded us as indifferent *in themſelves* as we will, provided we do but obſerve them on the account of their *Churches Injunction.* For whilſt we are pinched, and perplexed with fears of the unlawfulneſs of their *Additions*, we are apt the more to ſuſpect that Church to be but a *Step-mother* unto us, who will caſt us out of her care and family for ſuch things, which ſhe, thinking to be indifferent, might without prejudice relax her Commands concerning them: but we, thinking that our *Father* hath determined or commanded otherwiſe, cannot yield her our Obedience in them. Is not this,

this, as much as lies in that Church, *to deſtroy them for whom Chriſt died?* and to be ſure it is far from endeavouring (which yet is her duty) by all means to ſave ſome.

It is our *unſpeakable comfort* in the mean while, that he whom we ſerve, and who is our *Prince and Saviour*, hath a *Goodneſs towards* us, anſwerable to his *Power over* us: the one without the other would but ſpeak us as miſerable as now we may be happy. *Chriſt* in all his Commands did not conſider only the [illegible], but the τὸ δυνάμενον, he did not enjoin us all, which *as God* he might have done; but he commanded us ſuch things only which we, *as men*, could bear, and might be benefited by.

As for the power which the Pope aſſumes unto himſelf, to *diſpenſe with the Laws of God*; it is far above whatſoever our bleſſed Redeemer aſſumed, who proteſs'd that *he came not to deſtroy the Law, but to fulfil it.* But thus the Pope fulfils what was propheſied concerning him, that he *ſhould oppoſe and exalt himſelf above all that is called God.* Mat. 5. 17. 2 Theſ. 2. 4.

Yet this opinion of the *Popes or Churches Authority*, (though ſomewhat diverſified) is ſuch a *darling* opinion amongſt them, that could we believe and practiſe all that their Church propounds, or commands at preſent, unleſs we will become ἀνδράποδα δόλου, ſuch voluntary Slaves as to let our ears be bored, and henceforth never to queſtion their dictates, nor diſobey their future Commands, it would not avail us towards any Communion with them: for (ſaith *Bellarmine*) whoſoever *will not be fed by* Peter, that is, *learn of him and his Succeſſors (the Popes) as Judges and Determiners what he is to take for matter of Faith, and what is the ſenſe of the Scripture, is none of Chriſt's Sheep.* And the very *Form* of their Church (which makes it Antichriſtian as much as any thing) conſiſts in this manner of Government. This is the *Center* of Unity: from the Pope as ordinary Paſtor of the Univerſal Church, as from the Head, all life and motion is conveighed unto every individual Member. De verbo Dei, lib. 3. cap. 5. ſect. 4.

But ſuppoſe this *Authority* or Power to be more diffuſed, and to be ſubjected not in the *Pope alone*, but with his *Conſiſtory, or Council*; yet we cannot think that they will ever yield ought unto us, had we truth or right never ſo much on our ſide: for whilſt they hold their Church to be infallible, and that ſhe cannot decree amiſs in any matters of faith, or practice, we can never rationally hope for any redreſs. For ſo long as they maintain their Churches Infallibility, they will not alter nor reſcind any one thing, (were it to ſave the whole World) for if they do, their Churches Infallibility is gone for ever; and it *is by that Craft that they have their wealth.*

This then being the caſe between us, and the Church of *Rome*, that ſhe hath *ſeparated* us, and *caſt out our Names*, not for any opinion or practice that ſhe can charge us with contrary to the Word of God, or the Duty of Chriſtians; but rather for keeping *the Commandments of*

Mat. 5.11,12. *God, and the Faith of Jeſus.* We may *rejoice and be exceeding glad,* (as we are bidden) that we are thus reviled and perſecuted *for the Son of Man's ſake:* for not only our *reward ſhall be great in Heaven,* but here on Earth too. For as our *Saviour* found the blind man after he had been Joh. 9.35. caſt out for confeſſing of him, and imparted unto him a more full knowledge concerning himſelf; ſo *Chriſt* hath found the *Proteſtant Churches,* and affordéd them his preſence and care, communicating his Light and Love unto them; and nothing is more to be bewailed than that they have not been anſwerable unto ſuch mercy towards them. We may truly ſay that God hath turned their curſe into a bleſſing unto us: That *Brutum fulmen* (their Thunderbolt of Excommunication) hath not hurt one hair of our heads, much leſs hath it *entred into our ſouls.* For Dr. Hammond (*of Schiſm.*) as *Thomas de Curſelis in the Council of Baſil* did well obſerve, though Chriſt ſays, whatſoever *thou ſhalt bind on earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; he doth not ſay, Whatſoever thou ſhalt affirm to be bound, ſhall be ſo.* And as the Excommunication of the Jewiſh *Sanhedrim,* denounced againſt *Chriſt's Diſciples,* brought them ſo much nearer unto their Lord and Maſter, and aliened the Jews themſelves, removing them ſo much farther from the Kingdom of Heaven: ſo do all unjuſt Cenſures unite us to the Apoſtles, *&c.* by this conformity with, and participation of their ſufferings.

How out of the Church there is no Salvation. As for what the *Church of Rome* doth ſo frequently triumph in, and thinks to ſcare us with, *viz. That out of the Church there is no Salvation:* It is to be conſidered,

1. This *to be true indeed of the Catholick Church.* Taking it not as they do, for all them, and only them that are under the Paſtorſhip of the Pope, but for all *the real and living Members* of Chriſt: for they only are truly his *Body,* that are enlivened by his *Spirit.* Thus the Apoſtle joins them together, *Epheſ.* 4. 4. *There is one Body, and one Spi-*Rom. 8.9. *rit*; and elſewhere he ſays, that unleſs the *Spirit of Chriſt be in you, you are none of his.* As every member of the Body, and only the members of that Body are acted by the ſame Soul; ſo is it in the myſtical Body of Chriſt too. And it is the concern of all to obtain *the Spirit of Chriſt,* and *to live the life of Chriſt,* without which they cannot obtain *Salvation by Chriſt,* who is the Saviour only of his *Body.*

2. We acknowledge that it is every ones *duty* to join himſelf unto, and not cauſleſly *to depart from a viſible Church* that profeſſeth the Faith, and keepeth the Inſtitutions of Chriſt: Every one ought to en-Cant. 1.7. quire where it is *that this great Shepherd feedeth, and maketh his Flock to reſt*; and every needleſs departing from ſuch a Church, does endanger Salvation, in that it makes a man *truly guilty of Schiſm,* which is a great ſin againſt Charity, ſo highly recommended unto us: as alſo in that ſuch an one withdraws himſelf from thoſe Societies and Meetings Matth. 18.20. unto which *Chriſt* hath promiſed his preſence, and God beſtows his bleſſing.

3. But

3. But where this cannot be obtain'd, or is not ſinfully neglected or refuſed, one may *be ſaved without being joined to any viſible Church whatſoever.* If a Pagan, or a Jew, that is impriſoned in a Country where the Chriſtian Religion is not profeſs'd, (being by reading or conference through the goodneſs of God brought to the knowledge of the truth, and to profeſs it, living anſwerably unto it) though he ſhould die before that he could come to enjoy Church-Communion, we have no reaſon to doubt of his Salvation: our Saviour having told us, *That whoſoever believeth in him hath eternal life.* Joh. 6. 40.

But more particularly as to *the Church of Rome:* for ſo we call them that profeſſing to hold the Chriſtian Faith, are united in ſubjection and obedience unto that See, and do acknowledge the Pope their Univerſal Paſtor. When we call them a *Church*, we mean no more than that they are a ſociety or company of men, who *make profeſſion* that they are *Chriſtians.* Thus the *Laodiceans are called a Church*, Rev. 3. 14. though they *were wretched, and miſerable, and poor, and blind, and naked*; and we do not read of a ſound part amongſt them. Thus *God* himſelf calls the *Ten Tribes his People*, after their defection, by reaſon of *Circumciſion* which they yet retained, and their being the Off-ſpring of *Jacob.* In this ſenſe ſoundneſs of Faith is no more eſſential to a Church, than health is to a man. And as a *man* that hath the *Plague* or *Leproſie* is ſtill a *man*, though to be ſhunn'd: ſo they may be thus a Church, though by all means to be forſaken. But as they themſelves take a *Church* for a company of true believers joined together in Communion, ſo they are no Church, their Faith being far from *the Faith of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* *What we think concerning the Church of* Rome. Hoſ. 4. 6.

As for the *Succeſſion* they ſo much ſtand upon, and a *Lawful Miniſtry* only to be found amongſt them. No Church in the Chriſtian World hath ever had ſo many Interruptions, ſufficient to deſtroy, according to their own principles, the lawfulneſs of their Miniſtry. How many *Schiſms* hath there been in that Church? one of which alone laſted about fifty years: in which ſpace there was not one perſon in all their Communion but was *Excommunicated by one Pope or other*, (the right Pope being ever he that had moſt force or fraud) not to mention the *Simony and Hereſie* which ſome of them were ſo notoriouſly guilty of; and any of theſe are ſufficient to break the Chain of Succeſſion amongſt them. For I hope that they will not allow an Excommunicated perſon to have a power of Ordination. *Their Succeſſion broken.*

But beſides this, they who *are ordained* by any amongſt them, not being ordained to the work of a Miniſter, to preach or feed the Flock of Chriſt, or to ſerve him in the holy things of his own Inſtitution, but to *ſacrifice the Body of Chriſt for the living and for the dead*; how can they be *Goſpel-Miniſters?* This certainly is not a *Goſpel-Miniſtration*, (nor hath ſo much as a ſhew of it) but 'tis a repetition rather of the *Jews cruelty.*

But to prevent further Objections and miſtakes, we grant,

Two things granted to them. Rom 1.8.

1. That the Church of *Rome was a very famous Church*, whoſe *Faith was ſpoken of throughout the whole World.* Thus the ſeven Churches of *Aſia*, at leaſt ſome of them, were eminent and praiſe-worthy: but they can challenge no priviledge from what they have been, leſt the Jews themſelves come in with their pretenſions too, (who were once the only Church and people of God.) There is no greater ſtench than that which comes from a humane Body, when the Soul is once withdrawn: Nor is there any thing more abominable in God's account, than that Church or Society (call it what you will) from whom the Spirit of truth (who formerly did inform and enliven it) is departed.

2. We grant that the *Church of* Rome *had precedence before all other Churches:* but I would not be miſtaken; it hath had precedence before them, but for very many Centuries no ſuperiority over them; and this precedence which they had, was only becauſe *Rome* was the *Imperial City*, and Seat of the Empire. And 'tis moſt like that for this cauſe the *Epiſtle to the Romans* was put before all the other Epiſtles: the place in which that Church was gathered, and the perſons probably of which it did conſiſt, being more eminent and conſpicuous than others. But when *Conſtantinople* came to be the Seat of the Emperour, and made, and called *New-Rome*, it conteſted for that very precedency; and to this purpoſe it is remarkable that the *Patriarchates and Dioceſes* into which the Church-Government was then divided, did anſwer to the partitions and diviſions under the Civil Governours in that Empire: which did make indeed the Ladder for the *Biſhop of* Rome *to clime unto this height by.*

What they farther pretend unto.

As for their Pretenſions to the *Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, and Superiority over all Churches, they had need to produce an *Authentick Patent* for it; what they have already ſhewn, making nothing for their purpoſe. But I ſhall wave any farther diſcourſe upon that ſubject, becauſe it is out of my ſphere at preſent; as alſo although we ſhould grant the Church of *Rome* all her Pretenſions, *&c.* yet upon ſuppoſition,

First, *That ſhe is corrupted in her Doctrine and Worſhip.* And

Which howſoever will not ſerve her turn.

Secondly, *That ſhe excludes and anathematizes all that do not joyn in thoſe corruptions with her*; (both which particulars have been proved.) We may ſatisfie our ſelves in being parted from them, and anſwer all that they can ſay with theſe two Concluſions.

For two reaſons.

1. *God never did require of us to join with any perſon or Church in their ſins*; much leſs that we ſhould *ſin* in order to *the obtaining of Salvation at his hands.* God's Rule is, That we ſhould *not do evil that good may come of it.* And were the Communion with their Church never ſo uſeful, yet if it cannot be had without ſinning, it muſt not be had at all. If the terms or conditions of Communion with them have any thing of ſin in them, they had as good tell us that we ſhould fly in the Air, or count the ſands on the Sea-ſhore, and in caſe we did not, that then they would not receive us into their Communion; or that being in, they would

would caſt us out. For ſuch things as are *morally impoſſible*, (as an *aſſent* to any errour, or a *conſent* to any falſe worſhip muſt needs be) are as unreaſonably required of us, as any thing that is *naturally impoſſible* could ever be. And if on this account there be a Rent from them, the fault is in them that require ſuch things at our hands; as, being contrary to the mind and will of God, cannot be done by us. We being innocent, nay commendable in the forbearing of them, (as *the innocent perſon is in the caſe of a divorce*) muſt needs be free.

2. *It is ſometimes neceſſary to forſake a viſible Church.* Nay more, it may be neceſſary to *believe and act directly contrary to the Authority of the preſent Church.* Thus the *Jews* were bound to believe our Saviour for to be the *Meſſias*, and to hear and obey him in all things, though they were forbidden ſo to do by the *High Prieſts and Rulers*, who, we know, determined concerning *Chriſt* that he was a Seducer and a Blaſphemer. Yet what would not the *Church of Rome* give to have ſo clear and full a Teſtimony for her definitive Power in all Controverſies, as that *Jewiſh Church* had derived unto it from *God* himſelf? *Deut.*17.8 9.

But God never *parted with his Sovereignty which he hath over all men:* and where his mind and will is evident, that muſt be a Law paramount unto us, though it ſhould be never ſo much gainſaid by any other. All other Superiours are ſubordinate unto him, who is the only Lord in chief; nay, *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* And as thoſe Souldiers Rev. 19. 16. do but their duty, who out of a ſenſe of their ſworn Allegiance to their Prince, will not join with their Commander in the betraying of a Fort or Town: ſo if we dare not betray the Truths of God, nor the Souls of men unto the will of any whomſoever, we doubt not but that God does approve of our fidelity unto him, and will ſay unto us at the laſt, *Well done, good and faithful ſervants.*

And thus I have gone through ſome of thoſe many things which we have to plead for our *ſeparated* condition from the *Church of Rome*, whom we have ſo long, ſo undeſervedly ſuffered under. But though they have nothing for us but Execrations and Curſes, Fire and Faggot, yet let us return our bittereſt Lamentations over them, and heartieſt Prayers for them. It is a Lamentation, and ſhall be for a Lamentation, that ſo many millions of pretious ſouls are walking *in paths which lead to the chambers of death.* Oh that we could pluck them as *Brands out of everlaſting burnings.* One means only I would caution againſt, *viz.* Our *becoming theirs in hope to make them ours.* I might obſerve how God hath blaſted all ſuch endeavours, and that they have more ſtrengthened their hands, and weakned ours, than all the Weapons or Arguments that ever were uſed by them: and above all, God hath expreſly commanded us *to come out of her*, and not to *partake of her ſins.* But if Rev. 18. 4. by our careful and faithful inſtructing, our meek, charitable, and holy living, we can gain any of them, we ſhall *hide a multitude of ſins*, and James 5 ult. our *labour ſhall not be in vain in the Lord.*

In

Application. In the mean time if we should suffer still by them for well-doing, the Text affords us Considerations enough to sweeten such a suffering condition unto us.

Three Consolatory Inferences. 1. In that it is but from men: *When men shall hate you.* Now we know there is a *Nil ultra*, an utmost that men can do. 'Tis but to the Body, and it is but in this World.

2. It is for *the Son of Man's sake that we thus suffer*; and if he had required greater matters of us, would we not have done them? I am sure that he hath deserved them at our hands: besides, these *do turn for a Testimony* unto us of the Truth of his Doctrine, whose words we find so exactly fulfilled amongst us unto this day. Not to speak of the 2 Cor. 1. 5. *Consolation which shall abound by Christ in all them in whom the sufferings of Christ do abound.*

3. Christ hath pronounced such sufferers blessed: *Blessed are ye.*

1. 'Tis Christ's *Judgment on our case and condition.* And he, we may truly say then, sees not as man sees. What blessedness in the opinion of men can there be to be *hated, separated, reproached? &c.* But

2. It is not a bare opinion (though his could not be erroneous) that we are blessed, but it is Christ's effective sentence: his *dicere* is *facere.* Christ doth *make them blessed* whom he pronounces to be so; and he can make a blessed Persecution. *If he bless, who can curse?* or if they do, he can turn their Cursings into Blessings. Well may we then con- Psal. 109. 28. clude with the Prayer of the Psalmist, *Lord, let them curse, but bless thou.*

SERM.

SERMON XV.

Invocation of Saints and Angels, unlawful.

Rom. 10. 14. *How then ſhall they call on him in whom they have not believed?*

MY buſineſs being to ſhew the ſin and folly of the Papiſts in praying to Angels and Saints departed, I thought this Scripture would be a fit Introduction to it. This Text alone in the learned *Uſher*'s opinion (*a*) will put an end to this Controverſie amongſt thoſe that liſt not to be contentious. I ſhall not dilate upon the Context, let it ſuffice to tell you, that the ſcope of the Apoſtle is to prove, that there was a neceſſity of preaching the Goſpel to the Gentiles, as well as the Jews. He had ſhewed before that there is no difference betwixt them, that the *ſame Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him*, that the *Gentiles calling upon him ſhould be ſaved by him:* hence therefore he infers, that the Goſpel muſt needs be preacht to them, for as it follows in the Text, *How ſhall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how ſhall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how ſhall they hear without a Preacher?*

(*a*) In anſwer to a chal[illegible] made by a Jeſuite in *Ireland*, p. 377.

His way of arguing is ſuch as Logicians call Sorites, Rhetoricians a Gradation, and 'tis very forcible and demonſtrative. So alſo is his manner of ſpeaking, which is by way of Interrogation, which is the more convincing becauſe it carries with it a kind of an appeal to the perſons ſpoken to: the Interrogation here is equivalent to a Negation; *How ſhall they call upon him*; i.e. they cannot call upon him, 'tis not poſſible nor practicable; *in whom they have not believed?* the Original is, (*b*) on whom there muſt be a believing on him as well as in him, whom we invocate; *i.e.* there muſt be a fiducial truſting and relying upon him. All Supplication is founded on Faith, none implore his favour on whom they have not ſome reliance; we petition no others here on Earth, we muſt direct our prayers to no other in Heaven. Whoever is the Object of our prayers, muſt likewiſe be the Object of our truſt. Now 'tis God alone, (who is diſtinguiſht into Father, Son, and Spirit) in, or on whom we muſt believe, 'tis to him therefore, and him only that we muſt

(*b*) Εἰς ὃν πιστεύομεν.

must pray. He's accurst in Scripture that trusteth in any other, and so is he that religiously worships, or invocates any other but God alone. If Christ himself were a meer man, and not God as well as man, we should sin by believing in him, or by worshipping and calling upon him. 'Tis one Argument whereby we prove the Deity of our blessed Redeemer, that the Scripture doth every where represent him as the Object of Faith and religious Invocation.

This Foundation being laid, I come (without farther prefacing) to raise or build upon it this ensuing Proposition.

The Proposition.

The practice of the Papists in praying to Angels and Saints departed, is very blame-worthy and abominable in the sight of God.

In the handling hereof I shall first shew you that this is the practice of the Papists to pray unto Angels and Saints: secondly, that their so doing is very blame-worthy and abominable in the sight of God.

1. This is the Papists practice. To the end I may not falsly charge or accuse them, I shall in the first place set down the Doctrine of their Church about this matter, and that as it stands recorded in the Council of *Trent*. Thus then that Council hath determined, (c) "That the Saints reigning with Christ, "and offering up their prayers for men, it is "good and profitable humbly to invocate them, "and that we may obtain benefits of God, "through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is "our only Redeemer and Saviour, to have re-"course to their prayers, aid and assistance. 'Tis true, here's nothing decreed about the Invocation of Angels, (though that be also their common practice) but here's a positive Prescription about the Invocation of Saints. 'Tis good and profitable (says the Council) humbly to invocate them, to have recourse to their prayers; who besides their praying for us, are supposed to afford some other aid and assistance to us; and what should that be? why to confer Grace and Glory, and every good thing. That this is intended, will appear, if you consider in the next place those forms of prayer that are in common use amongst them. And here I shall not instance in those pieces of devotion which are muttered in private corners or Closets, but in such as are read or sung in their publick Churches or Assemblies. In the *Breviary*, or *Hours of Sarum*, (which was in great request here in *England* before the Reformation) I find many pretty strains of Devotion; sometimes to all the Quire of Angels in general, sometimes to this and the other Angel in particular; to *Michael*, *Gabriel*, *Raphael*, whom they dignifie with the Title of Archangel. But in

(c) *Sanctis una cum Christo regnantibus, & orationes pro hominibus offerentibus; bonum atque utile est suppliciter eos invocare, & ob beneficia a Deo impetranda, per filium ejus Jesum Christum, qui solus noster Redemptor & Salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere.* C. Trid. Sess 9.

Invocandi sunt Sancti eo quod pro solute hominum preces assidue faciunt multaque eorum merito & gratia in nos Deus confert beneficia; Rogati peccatorum veniam nobis impetrant & conciliant nobis Dei gratiam. V. plura in Catechism. ex Decret. Concil. Trident. pontif. jussu edit.

in that and in other *Breviaries*, they are far more liberal of their prayers to the Saints; though they are made a little lower, yet the devotion of the Papists is carried a little higher to them than to the Angels: to these, and to their prayers, aid and assistance, they are more particularly directed, (as you heard) and accordingly they practise. Of these they don't only desire that they would pray for them, (as some of their later Writers, mincing the matter, do pretend) that indeed would be less culpable, though altogether, as we shall see, unwarrantable: but these they formally invocate, and pray unto, and that with the same shew of Devotion which they use to God himself. To these they build Temples, erect Altars, burn Incense, make Vows and Promises, *&c.* *(d)* These they dignifie with the same Names, Titles and Attributes as they do our Saviour himself; and of these they ask the same blessings and favours as they do of God, and which are beyond the power of any meer Creature in Heaven or Earth to give. *(e)* In particular they pray unto them to enlighten their eyes, to increase their virtues, to pacifie their consciences, to pardon their sins, to comfort and save their souls, *&c.* 'Tis a poor plea of *Bellarmine*'s, *(f)* whereby he attempts to defend such prayers, *that though the words themselves may seem to imply more than a meer praying to the Saints to pray for us, yet that's all which they intend.* To this purpose also a later Writer delivereth himself: *'Tis not*, says he, (g) *the dead words, but the invention of the Speaker that animates them, that makes them to be a Prayer.* And again; *'Tis the sense that makes the words to be prayer, and not the bare characters or letters; and that the Churches sense is no other but to desire the Saints to obtain for us the blessings expresst in those forms, is manifest from her frequent intermixing that usual form of* Pray for us, *and from her publick Doctrine as declared in the Council of* Trent, *and inculcated to all the faithful in their Catechisms.* To all which it may be replied, That many use these Prayers who never were instructed concerning any such Interpretations of them. And from whence should men learn the sense of your Prayers, but from the known signification of the words used in them? If their Leaders did mean as some of them speak and write for the better colouring and gilding over this abomination, why don't they all this while reform their *Breviaries*, and Forms of Devotion, and so frame the Petitions or Prayers therein, that they may be a little accommodated to this sense that they would seem to put upon them? *(h)* A learned person speaking to this very case, brings the Papists to this *Dilemma*: *Those*

(d) *S. Claudi desolatorum consolator, captivorum liberator, resurrectio mortuorum, lumen cæcorum, auditus Surdorum, sanator languidorum, tutor naufragantium, via errantium, salus omnium in te sperantium, &c.* Hor. Sec. us. Rom. 6. die Junii.

(e) *O beati Apostoli Dei solvite me a peccatis, defendite me a pœnis inferni, & de potestate tenebrarum. Confortate me, & ad regnum æternum me perducite. Omnes Sanctæ Virgines Dei, adjuvate me, ut habeam bonam voluntatem cordis, corporis Sanitatem, castitatem, & post cursum vitæ mæ, Societatem perpetuæ beatitudinis.* Ibid.

(f) De Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 17.

(g) Cath. no Idol. p. 402, 404.

(h) Dr. *Stillingfleet's Idolatry of the Church of* Rome, p. 166.

Thoſe, ſays he, *of the* Roman *Church that uſe theſe forms, and that according to the known ſenſe of the words, either they do well or ill in ſo doing: if they do ill, then their Church is guilty of intolerable negligence in not preventing of it: if they do well, then their Church allows of more than bare praying to Angels and Saints to pray for them.*

It muſt be confeſt the Church of *Rome* hath laid aſide ſome of her old *Breviaries* and Offices, yet becauſe they were formerly allowed and enjoined, ſhe muſt be accountable for them, until ſhe confeſs her errour and miſtake.

Before I paſs this Head, let me ſhew you one thing in their practice that deſerves a particular remark; and that is the *hyperdulia* (as they call it) or the tranſcendent ſervice and worſhip which they beſtow upon the Virgin *Mary*. Her they ſalute and call upon under the terms of the *Queen of Heaven*, the *Gate of Glory*, and *Fountain of Mercy*, and *Mother of all Grace*: She is a *Goddeſs*, *Savioureſs*, *Advocateſs*, *Mediatrix*, *Empreſs*, and what not? For her they have many particular Offices, * and to her they direct more prayers than unto God himſelf. To *one Pater Noſter* they are taught to ſay *ten Ave Maries*; which being five times ſaid, makes one *Roſary*, or *Chaplet of Prayers*: and to the end they might not be deceived in their tale, they ſay that St. *Dominick* (it may be one of our Ladies Chaplains) did invent the uſe of *Beads*. Of her their approved and renowned Doctors affirm many incredible things; as (i) that *She being the Mother of the Son of God, who doth produce the Holy Ghoſt, therefore all the Gifts, Virtues and Graces of the Holy Ghoſt, are by her hand adminiſtred to whom ſhe pleaſeth, when ſhe pleaſeth, how ſhe pleaſeth, and as much as ſhe pleaſeth.* They teach that ſhe is (k) *conſtituted over every Creature, and whoſoever doth bow his knee unto Jeſus, doth fall down alſo and ſupplicate his Mother; ſo that the Glory of the Son may be judged not ſo much to be common with the Mother, as to be the ſame.* (l) That *She aſſumes to her ſelf of the Omnipotency of her Son, as much as ſhe pleaſeth, and that ſhe comes* (m) *before the Golden Altar of Humane Reconciliation, not interceding only, but commanding, a Miſtreſs, not a Servant.* (n) They tell us, *That the*

* In the Pſalter approved by the Doctors of *Sorbon*, I find this prayer to the Virgin *Mary*: *My only Succour, my lips are bound to publiſh no other praiſes but thine. By thee the head of the Serpent hath been bruiſed, the world repaired, thy Power is boundleſs. Unto thee I confeſs my ſins, into thy hands I commit my ſoul. Come unto* Mary, *ye which have thirſt, pray unto her, that with her water ſhe will waſh away the filthineſs of your ſins*, &c.

(i) *Mater eſt filii Dei qui producit S.S. ideo omnia dona virtutis & gratiæ ipſius S. S. quibus vult, quando vult, quomodo vult, & quantum vult per manum ipſius adminiſtrantur.* Bernardin. Senenſ. Serm. 61. artic. 1. c. 8. (k) *Conſtituta eſt ſuper omnem creaturam, & quicunque Jeſu curvat genu, Matri quoque pronus ſupplicat, & filii gloriam cum Matre non tam communem judico quam eandem.* Arnold Carn. tract. de laud. Virgin. (l) *Ipſa Dei Mater de Omnipotentia filii ſui, cui eſt innixa quantum vult ſibi aſſumit.* Buſt. Marial. part. 12. Serm. 2. (m) *Accedit ante aureum humanæ reconciliationis altare, non ſolum regans ſed imperans, Domina non ancilla.* Damian. Serm. 1. de Nativit. B. Mar. (n) *Dedit B. Virg. Rex regum Pater cœleſtis dimidium regni ſui, quod ſignificatum eſt in Heſter regina, &c. Sic Pater cœleſtis cum habeat juſtitiam, & miſerecordiam, tanquam potiora regni ſui bona, juſtitia ſibi retenta miſerecordiam Matri Virgini conceſſit.* Gab. Bret. in Canon. Miſſæ, Lect. 80. *Si quis ſentit ſe gravari a foro juſtitiæ Dei, appellet ad forum miſerecordiæ Matris ejus.* Bernardin. de Buſtis Manal. part. 3. Serm. 3. in Excellent. 4. & Part. 5. Serm. 7. in Excellent. 5.

History of Ahasuerus *in* Esther, *was a Figure of God's bestowing half his Kingdom upon the blessed Virgin; that having Justice and Mercy, as the chiefest Goods of his Kingdom, he retained Justice to himself, and granted Mercy unto her. Hence if a man find himself aggrieved in the Court of God's Justice, he may appeal to the Court of Mercy of his Mother, she being that Throne of Grace whereof the Apostle speaketh in the* Hebrews, Let us go boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may receive Mercy, and find Grace to help in a time of need.

In respect of her, they say, (o) *God after a sort is more bound to us, than we are to him.* (p) *She in some respect did greater things to God, than God himself did to us and all Mankind.* (q) *She only said, He that is mighty hath done great things to me: but of her we may say, She hath done greater things to him that is mighty.* Farther they tell us, (r) *That though she be subject to God, in as much as she is a Creature*; yet is she said to *be Superiour, and prefer'd before him, in as much as she is his Mother.* Hence they call upon her *in a Mothers right to command her Son* (f). Yea, in our Ladies Psalter, which is made in imitation of *David's* Psalms, the Name of *God* is every where expunged, and the Name of the *Virgin Mary* put in its place. *Our Lord* is changed into *our Lady.* In stead of *(In thee O Lord,)* it is, *In thee, O Lady, I put my trust, let me never be confounded.* In stead of *(Let the Lord arise,)* it is, *Let our Lady arise, and let her Enemies be scattered.* In stead of *(O come let us sing unto the Lord,)* it is, *O come let us sing unto our Lady, and make a joyful noise to the Queen of our Salvation.* The very rehearsal of these things is enough to make your ears to tingle, and your hair to stand an end. Oh how patient is God in bearing with the provocations of the Papacy!

(o) *Propter B. Virg. Deus quodammodo plus obligetur nobis quam nos sibi.* Bernardin. Senens, Serm. 61. Art. 1. c. 11.

(p) *Plus fecit Deo,* Id. ibid.

(q) *Tu fecisti majora ei qui potens est, &c.* in Eustis Marial. part. 6. Serm. 2.

(r) *Licet sit subjecta Deo in quantum creatura superior tamen illi dicitur in quantum est ejus Mater.* Id. par. 12. Serm. 2.

(f) *Jure Matris impera dilect ff. tuo filio Domino nostro Jesu Christo.* Bonavent. Cor. B. M. Virg. Tom. 6. Rom. Edit. A. 1588. *Ora patrem, Jube natum, O felix puerpera pians scelera, Jure Matris impera redemptori. Ora suppliciter, præcipe sublimiter.* Hist. sec. Char. August. de Commem. B. M. Virg.

2. The second thing to be considered is this, that this practice of the Papists is very blame-worthy and abominable in the sight of God. A little reflection upon what hath been already declared, might serve for confirmation hereof, and be in stead of a thousand Arguments with all those who have the least Zeal of God's Honour remaining in them. However, *(ex abundanti)* I shall attempt the proof of what I have propounded, by shewing you, that this practice of the Romanists is,

1. Unscriptural. It hath not any warrant from the Word of God: this is acknowledged by the most ingenuous amongst themselves. (t) *Bannesius* confesseth, that *it is not taught in the holy Scriptures, neither* 'Tis Unscriptural.

(t) *Orationis ad Sanctos faciendos neque expresse neque involute S. Litera docent.* 2. Qu. 1. Artic. 10. Lib. 1.

ther expreſly nor covertly, that Prayers are to be made to the Saints. Bellarmine tells us, (u) *It was not the manner under the Old Teſtament to ſay, Holy* Abraham, *pray for us*, &c. For which he gives ſeveral reaſons, as, *That the Fathers were then ſhut up in priſon, and did not ſee God*, &c. *Salmeran* ſays the ſame, and withal adds, (w) *That there is nothing expreſt in the Goſpels, or the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles touching this matter. It would have been hard*, ſays he, (x) *to enjoin ſuch a thing on the Jews, and the Gentiles would have thought that many Gods were put upon them inſtead of the many Gods they had forſaken.* And if they had not themſelves confeſt, they might eaſily have been convinced that there are no footſteps at all of this practice in the holy Scripture. In all the Book of God there is not one precept for praying to Saints, nor any example of any one of God's people that ever made ſuch a prayer, nor any promiſe that ſuch a way of praying ſhall be accepted, nor any puniſhment threatned in caſe it be neglected. The Scripture every where makes God to be the only Object of Prayer and Invocation: how many hundred Petitions or Prayers are upon record there, and not one of them put up to any other? When the Lord taught his Diſciples, and us in them to pray, he directs them to ſay, *Our Father which art in Heaven.* The Scripture often expreſſeth this duty by the term of *praying* only, without any mention of the Object: *When you pray, uſe not vain Repetitions: When thou prayeſt, enter into thy Cloſet*, &c. And hereby 'tis intimated, that Prayer in matter of Religion can ſignifie nothing elſe but praying unto God; it is not Prayer if it be directed to any other.

(u) De Beat. Sanctit. c. 19.

(w) In 1 Tim. 2. 2. diſput. 7. 8. Ec. Enchyrid. c 15. Suar. Tom 2. in diſput. Tho. 42. Sect. 1. V. Eccium in Enchyrid. ſuo.

(x) Durum erat id Judæis percipere, & Gentibus daretur occaſio putandi multos ſibi Deos, &c. Salmer. ut ſup.

Chriſtians were required, when infirm, to have recourſe to the prayers of living Saints, and were told the fervent prayers of ſuch were prevalent. Why were they not directed to the Patriarchs and Prophets, to the bleſſed Virgin, to St. Steven *and St.* James, *and other early Martyrs of the Church, whoſe Prayers it ſeems by the Church of* Rome *are highly meritorious, and far more prevailing? This ſhould have been the rather inculcated, becauſe it was novel practice, and never uſed by the* Roman *Church; and therefore they had need of an expreſs to encourage them to ſuch Devotions.* Dr. *Whitby*'s Diſcourſe of the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, p. 188.

This being the caſe, the Popiſh practice muſt needs be an abomination. God will allow of nothing in his Service and Worſhip but what he himſelf hath inſtituted. 'Tis a ſaying of Biſhop *Davenant*, (y) *That all the neceſſary parts of Religious Worſhip do ſo depend upon the will of God revealed in his Word, that whatſoever is not founded in his Word, is contrary to his Will.* To this purpoſe alſo is that of St. *Auguſtine*, (z) *Deum ſic colere oportet quomodo ſeipſum colendum eſſe præcipit: We ought ſo to worſhip God as he hath appointed himſelf to be worſhipt.* Hear what the Scripture it ſelf ſays, *Deut.* 12. *ult.* the Iſraelites are dehorted from uſing the religious Rites and Cuſtoms of the Heathens in the worſhipping of God; how then? in what manner muſt they worſhip him? *Whatſoever thing he commands they muſt obſerve to do, they may not add thereto, nor diminiſh from it.* To all which may that of our Saviour be added, *Mat.* 15. 9. *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men:* i. e. preſſing mens Traditions in the room of Chriſt's Inſtitutions.

(y) *Quæ in verbo non fundentur divinæ voluntati adverſentur.* Dav. Deter. Qu. 44.

(z) De Conſenſ. Evangel.

One

One thing more may be conſidered under this Head, that the worſhipping of Saints and Angels, (*a*) (of which Prayer and Invocation is a principal part) it is not only Unſcriptural, but Antiſcriptural, as 'tis not commanded, ſo 'tis forbidden in the Scripture: there 'tis written, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* I am not ignorant of the Popiſh diſtinction betwixt λατρεία and δουλεία; the former they ſay belongs only to God, the latter may be applyed to the Creature. But how often have they been told and convinced, that theſe are uſed reciprocally both in ſacred and prophane Writ? (*b*) and ſome of themſelves have been ſo ingenuous as to acknowledge it. He that firſt coin'd this diſtinction, was no Critick in the Greek Tongue (*c*), nor did he ever intend it in the Popiſh ſenſe. He himſelf confeſſeth, that both the one and the other belong only to God: *The one is due to him as he is our Lord, the other as he is our God.* Nor when our Saviour uttered thoſe words, was he deſired of the Devil to defer that ſervice to him which they call the ſuperiour and higheſt Worſhip, nor did he pretend to be God himſelf, but only to be his Miniſter, and to enjoy what he offered by the bounty of God, and a little religious proſtration would have ſerved his turn. But what ſays Chriſt to him? *Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve:* the word *only* is not in the Old Teſtament Text (*d*), where it is recorded, but our Saviour puts it in to ſhew that God, and none but him, is the Object of Religious Worſhip and Service. Hence 'tis alſo that an Angel chides the Apoſtle *John* for offering Religious Service to him: *See thou do it not*, ſays he, *Rev.* 19.10. and 22.9. *I am thy fellow-ſervant:* the word is (σύνδουλος,) I am thy fellow *in dulia*, he rejects that kind of Worſhip which the Papiſts ſay belongs to Saints and Angels. And then it follows, *Worſhip God*; he is the only Object of Religious Worſhip. Don't worſhip one that is thy fellow-ſervant and Worſhipper.

(*a*) *Eximium adorationis genus Bellar. delectos triumph.*

(*b*) *Quid ſi & una religionis virtus ſit, quæ latriam dulliamque continet? certe plurimis atque ſapientiſſ. ea eſt opinio.* Nic. Serar. in Litan. 2. Qu. 27 V. P. du Moulin de novit. Pap. L. 7. c. 13.

(*c*) *Aug. Ego quid, Græcæ linguæ perparum aſſecutus ſum, & prope nihil.* Cont. Petitian. l. 2. c. 28. Cont. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 21.

(*d*) Deut. 6. 13.

2. This practice is irrational, 'tis not (λογικὴ λατρεία,) a rational ſervice: there is nothing more abſurd; the abſurdity of it appears in theſe two particulars. 'Tis irrational.

1. Conſider their incapacity to hear the Prayers that are directed to them. 'Tis own'd on all hands to be ridiculous and irrational to pray to them that cannot hear our prayers. The Text ſays, *How ſhall we call on them in whom we don't believe?* and I may add, How ſhall we call on them who can't hear us? That this is the caſe of the glorified Spirits, is evident, becauſe, 1. They are not *Omnipreſent*, they are circumſcrib'd and finite Creatures, and can be but in one place at once. I dare affirm this of the Virgin *Mary* her ſelf: And how then ſhall ſhe hear the prayers of 100000 perſons, who it may be are praying to her at one and the ſame time, ſome of them in this Hemiſphere, and ſome in the other? and if ſhe can't hear, I doubt me ſhe can't help thoſe that are ſo much devoted to her ſervice. 2. They are not *Omni-percipient*, if

if they ſhould hear what men ſay with their mouths, they cannot perceive or underſtand what men ſay in their hearts. Now the moſt of our Prayers, (e) eſpecially in our private Devotions, are meerly mental, they are (*conceptus animi*) ſuch as are conceived in our hearts and minds; yea, the moſt acceptable Prayers conſiſt many times in thoſe ſighs and groans which are never uttered. To ſay the Saints and Angels are privy to theſe, is to deifie them. There's never a meer Creature in Heaven but will confeſs (as *David* doth in another caſe) *that ſuch knowledge is too painful and too wonderful for him.* This is an incommunicable property and perfection of God, ſo *Solomon* affirmeth, 2 *Chron.* 6. 30. *Thou only knoweſt the hearts of the children of men.*

It is diſputed whether the Saints in Heaven have any knowledge at all of humane affairs on Earth: many wiſe and learned men are of an opinion to the contrary, and ſo the Scripture it ſelf ſeems to be (f). This we may affirm with the greateſt confidence, that they have no ſuch knowledge as is neceſſary in this caſe, they can neither hear nor underſtand the Prayers that men offer up unto them, nor (which is alſo requiſite) with what mind they offer them, whether in ſincerity or in hypocriſie.

The Papiſts themſelves are greatly divided to this day about this matter, and can neither ſatisfie themſelves nor one another, how the glorified Saints come to have notice of our Supplications: (g) many nice and curious Queſtions they have; as, Whether the Souls of thoſe they pray to be preſent or abſent? if they be preſent, then whether it be really or virtually? if they be abſent, and have information from others, then whether it be from the Angels, or from God himſelf? or if it be from God, then whether it be by particular revelation from him, or by the beatifical Viſion of him? Thus theſe *Babel*-builders are confounded and diſtracted; they agree (as I hinted before) that the Saints in Heaven muſt be made acquainted with our Prayers, or elſe in vain are they invocated: but how they come at it, *non convenit inter omnes*, ſays *Pinello*, all are not agreed about it. Some of them are much taken with a conceit of a Looking-glaſs in the face of God, wherein thoſe bleſſed Spirits have a full view of all things paſt, preſent and to come: this is a pretty Notion, and 'tis pity that it hath no more univerſal reception: but alas, (this *Speculum Trinitatis vel Deitatis*) this Looking-glaſs in God's face or eſſence, was broken in pieces long ago, and now ſome of their own can ſee nothing in it but the folly and raſhneſs of thoſe that invented it, without any warrant in the Word of God. *Cajetan*, *Gabriel*, *Durandus*, *Scotus*, *Occam*, and a many other great Names, will not be beholding to this Imaginary Glaſs. Nor will that Text, *In thy light we ſhall ſee light*; nor that ſaying, (*qui videt videntem omnia is videt omnia*) He ſees all things that ſees him who ſees all things, eſtabliſh the belief of it. If it were ſo, that he that ſeeth God, ſeeth whatever is in God, and whatever God ſeeth, then the Angels that

(e) *Plerumque hoc negotium plus gemitibus quam ſermonibus agitur, plus fletis quam affatu.* Aug. Ep. 121.

(f) Job 14.21. 2 King. 22.20. Eccleſ 9.5. Iſai. 63. 16. *Auguſt. dicit Mortui neſciunt etiam ſancti, quid agant vivi, etiam eorum filii.* Anſel. Laud. Gloſſ. interlinear. in loc. prædict. V. Gratian. Gloſſ. in 13 qu. de Mortuis. Aug. de cura pro mortuis c. 13 Si rebus viventium intereſſent animæ mortuorum, &c. *If* (ſays he) *ſo great and famous Patriarchs as* Abraham *and* Jacob *did not underſtand how the World went with their poſterity, how can it be that the dead ſhould at all take notice of the living, or intermeddle with aſſiſting them?* &c.

(g) *See Doctor* White's *Defence of the true way to the true Church*, p. 105, 106.

that always behold his face, and look up to this Glaſs, would never have ſtoopt down to pry as they did into the myſteries of the Goſpel, and needed not to have been informed by the Church about the manifold Wiſdom of God: then they would not be to ſeek concerning any future events, no nor be ignorant of the day and hour of the laſt Judgment.

2. Conſider what manner of Saints many of them are, whom the Papiſts ſolemnly invocate and pray unto: they are ſuch whoſe Sainthip, nay whoſe exiſtence is very queſtionable. *Caſſander* (one of their own party) makes this complaint, (h) *That the people do now almoſt deſpiſe the old Saints, and ſerve with more affection the new, whoſe holineſs is leſs certain; yea, there are ſome of them, of whom we may juſtly doubt whether ever they lived in the world.* 1. They call upon ſome of doubtful Sainthip or Holineſs, who in ſtead of reigning in Heaven, are frying it may be in Hell. He muſt be of an eaſie belief, that can be certainly perſwaded that every one whom the Pope Canonizeth, and putteth into the Liſt of Saints, is ſo indeed. The Romaniſts themſelves (i) acknowledge that in a *matter of fact his infallible Holineſs may be miſtaken, and that there may be an errour in this very buſineſs of Canonization.* And ſome are ſtrongly of opinion that the Pope was out when he Canonized *Thomas Becket* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and commanded the people of *England*, *annually to celebrate the day of his paſſion, and that by Prayers to him they ſhould endeavour to merit the remiſſion of their ſins:* Now this *Thomas*, for ought that can appear in his Hiſtory, and that as related by their own Writers, (k) was a proud *Prelate*, and a Rebel to his Prince: One that had ſet the whole Nation in a flame to defend the Popes quarrel againſt the King, and when he died was rather the Pope's, than God's Martyr, ſeeing he died not for the Faith of Chriſt, but for the Defence of the Popiſh Tyranny and Uſurpation. 'Tis a good diverſion to read his Hiſtory as it's ſet together by Doctor *Patrick* in his Reflections upon the Devotion of the Roman Church, there you may find what a kind of Saint he was, and what Devotions the people by thouſands paid to his Shrine. Yea, the people were ſo devoutly affected to this new Saint, that in reſpect of him, they ſcorned to have but little Conſideration of the bleſſed Virgin, or of Chriſt himſelf: for there being three Altars in the Church of *Canterbury*, one to Chriſt, another to the Virgin *Mary*, and a third to this St. *Thomas*, the Offerings at his Shrine came to about a thouſand pounds, when thoſe to the Virgin *Mary* came not to five pounds, and to Chriſt nothing at all. The people were the more encouraged in their Devotion, becauſe of the lying Legends and fabulous Miracles that were reported to be wrought upon thoſe that did invocate and pray unto him. One pleaſant ſtory may not be omitted, and it is of a little Bird that was taught to ſpeak, and could ſay St. *Thomas*. It happened that this Bird ſitting out of his Cage, was ſeiz'd by a Spar-Hawk, who being ready to devour it, the Bird

(h) *Conſult. de artic. religionis, Cap. de meritis & intercеſſ. Sanct.*

(i) *Th. Aquin. Cajetan, Melch. Canus.*

(k) *Neubrigenſ. de reb. Ang. l. 2. c. 16. Baron. Annal. ad An. 1163.*

(l) *Festiv. fol. 80. Anton. Hist. Tom. 2. p. 707.*

Bird cryed *St. Thomas, St. Thomas* (l): whereupon the Spar-Hawk fell down dead, and the pretty Bird was saved alive. Now, says a devout Author, (and doubtless his inference is strong and concluding) *if St.* Thomas *of his great Grace heard and helpt this poor Bird, much more will he hear a Christian man or woman that cries to him for help and succour.*

Let me instance but in one more of their Saints, (the Papists will be very angry if they hear I call his Saintship in question) and that is St. *Francis* the Founder of the *Franciscan Order*. He's no ordinary person with them: his Admirers parallel him with Christ, in the Prophesies that were before of him, in his Birth, Life, Temptations, Doctrine, Miracles, and what not? This and a great deal more may be read of him in his Book of Conformities, which was not long since (*m*) publisht with allowance. Of him, (*n*) one sings, *Qui Franciscus erat nunc tibi Christus erit.*

(m) *An.* 1590.
(n) *Turselline.*

Francis *he was won't to be,*
Now he shall be Christ *to thee.*

(o) Bonaventure, *thence as a Motto 'tis placed under his picture.*

Another great person (*o*) swore at *Paris*, it was revealed to him of God, that St. *John* (by the Angel that had the Seal of the living God in the *Revelation*) meant no other than this St. *Francis:* yea, such is their esteem of his Intercession, that they prefer it to Christ's, and say, (*Christus oravit, & Franciscus exoravit*) Christ hath pray'd, *Francis* hath obtain'd.

And yet who so reads the aforesaid Book of his Conformities, and *Bonaventure* of his Life, and other Chronicles and Records of him under the Papists own hands, will soon find that he was a strange kind of Saint, nay, that he did a multitude of things that argued him destitute of common sense. What will you say of a man that shall preach to Birds and Beasts, and salute them kindly with saying, (p) *Brother Bird*, and *Brother Beast?* What if you should see a man taking up the Lice that fall from his Garments, and putting them on again, for fear it may be of wronging or dislodging those poor innocent Creatures? What can be said for cutting his Garments in pieces, and then giving them away? unless it were that he might give to the more. What will you say to his tumbling in the mire? unless it were a significant Ceremony. And to his making Crucifixes of Mortar as Children do Babies of Dirt, with his own hands? Once more, what shall one think of his making a Wife of Snow, and of his embracing her to allay his amorous and lustful heat? These, with many more such ridiculous actions, shew him to be a Bedlam brain-sick Creature: and though by me he shall be no farther censured, yet I see no reason why he should be Sainted, much less why he should be so blasphemously magnified and adored.

(p) *Wadding, An.* 1212. n. 30. 31. *Bonavent. vit Franciscus.*

2. They invocate some that are of dubious existence, as well as holiness.

holineſs. As they have many ſuſpected, ſo they have many feigned or fabulous Saints in the Church of *Rome*. What Chriſt ſaid of the *Samaritans*, may as truly be ſaid of the *Romaniſts*, *They worſhip they know not what, yea they know not who.* Who would imagine this people ſhould be ſo blinded and beſotted as to worſhip and invocate imaginary Saints? In the aforeſaid *Breviary* or Hours of *Sarum*, (q) I find St. *Chriſtopher* prayed unto whom they ſuppoſe to have been a Giant of a prodigious ſtature; *Mantuan* ſays (r) he was many Ells high. *Ludovicus Vives* ſays, he ſaw a Tooth of his bigger than his Fiſt. Of him it is reported that he carried Chriſt over (*marinum flumen*) an Arm of the Sea, and at laſt became his Martyr, as well as his Bearer. Another Office you may there find to the three Kings of *Collen* (ſ), who are invocated by the Names of *King Jaſpar, King Melchior, and King Balthazar*, and are intreated *by the King of Kings whom they merited to ſee crying in his Cradle, to compaſſionate their Suppliants in their miſeries.* (t) A farther Office may be there ſeen for the moſt holy *Urſula*, and *the eleven thouſand Virgins*, her Companions, who were all Martyrs. The Hiſtory of theſe Virgin-Martyrs is variouſly reported by their own Authors, the moſt agree that they were killed at *Collen* by the barbarous *Hunns*, where they were all interr'd, and many of their precious Reliques are reſerv'd to this day; and it did not a little encourage them in their Martyrdom, that Chriſt had ſent his Vicar amongſt them, Pope *Ciriacus*, to abſolve them from their ſins, and to die a Martyr with them. Others indeed report otherwiſe concerning them, and we Hereticks in ſuch uncertainties muſt be excuſed if we doubt whether ever there were any ſuch number of Virgin (*u*) Martyrs or no, and do think the Church of *Rome* ridiculous (to ſay no more at preſent) in conferring on ſuch Imaginary Saints Religious Worſhip and Invocation. I could inſtance in many more ſuch like Popiſh Saints, (*w*) as the *Seven Sleepers*, who ſlept in a time of grievous Perſecution 362 years, and afterwards in the Reign of *Theodoſius* awak'd, and are deſervedly worſhip'd (one would think) in the Church of *Rome*. And St. *Longinus* (*x*) the Souldier, that with his Lance pierc'd our Lord Jeſus upon the Croſs, and being almoſt blind, with the ſparkling of that Blood, immediately received his ſight, and believed; and being inſtructed by the Apoſtles, forſook his Military Profeſſion, and lived thirty eight years a Monaſtick life in *Capadocia*; and was at laſt martyred for the Chriſtian Faith.

(q) *Et ſec. uſum Romanum.*

(r) *L. 7. Faſtor.*

(ſ) *Hor. ſec. uſum Sarum & ſec. uſum Roman.* 1570.

(t) *V. Brev. Rom. reform.* 21 *Octob. Hortul. animæ ſec. uſ. antiq. Ecc. Rom.*

(u) *In the Golden Legend printed at* Lond. A. 1512. *the company is made* 26000.

(w) *Brev. ſec. uſ. Sarum* 27 *Julii & miſſale Sarum* A. 1554

(x) *Brev. Rom. antiq. Martii* 15.

Whoſo conſults the *Roman Breviaries*, will meet with many more of this ſort; yea, with ſome that their own Authors call Symbolical Saints, which yet are worſhipped and invocated with the greateſt formality: but enough of this ſecond particular, that 'tis an abſurd and irrational ſervice.

3. This practice is Idolatrous. The Romaniſts are much offended at this charge: *Any man* (y) (ſays a late Writer) *of common reaſon would*

'Tis Idolatrous

(y) *Cath. no Idol.* p. 334.

would think it were as eaſie to prove Snow to be black, as ſo innocent a practice to be Idolatry. But it may be he is miſtaken. It is agreed on all hands that Idolatry, in the proper notion of it, is a giving that worſhip and ſervice to the Creature, which is due only to God: yea, though men worſhip God, yet if they worſhip a Creature alſo, they are Idolaters. The Apoſtle (z) reproves thoſe *that worſhipped the Creature* (παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα) *beſides the Creator.* And this was the Idolatry of thoſe that *Shalmaneſer* ſent to inhabit *Samaria*, (a) *they feared the Lord, and ſerved other, or their own gods.* Now that the Papiſts give religious worſhip to Saints and Angels as well as unto God, is evident by their own profeſſion and practice: only they think they may help themſelves out with the aforeſaid diſtinction of (b) *Latria* and *Dulia*, the verity of which we have already ſeen. To the ſame purpoſe is that diſtinction of theirs, of ſuperiour and abſolute Worſhip as due to God, and inferiour and relative Worſhip as applicable to the Creature. Whereas if, by inferiour and relative, they mean religious Worſhip, as they muſt do if they ſpeak to the thing in queſtion, then we anſwer, that there is no foundation for any ſuch diſtinction in the whole Book of God. And it would have ſtood the *Arrians* in great ſtead if it had been then invented, for by the help of ſuch a diſtinction they might eaſily have enervated the force of the Apoſtle's Argument, whereby he proves the Deity of Chriſt, becauſe the *Angels of God are enjoined to worſhip him.* To this they might readily have replied, That the Text intends a religious Worſhip of an inferiour degree, ſuch as may be given to the moſt excellent Creature. If the *Socinians* now get this by the end, they may thank the Papiſts for it.

(z) Rom. 1. 25. *Non tantum Creatorem ſed præterea Creaturas coluerunt* ſic παρὰ uſurpatur, 1 Cor. 3. Gal. 1.

(a) 2 Kin. 17. 33

(b) עבד *ſervire, modo verbo* δουλεύειν, *modo verbo* λατρεύειν *indifferentur ſit verſum. Confer* Luc. 4. 8. cum Deut. 6. 13. & 10. 20. item Act. 7. 6, 7. cum Gen. 15. 13. *Idem Septuag. indifferenter verterunt, per vocem* λατρεύειν *reddiderunt*, Exod. 4. 23. & 23. 25. Deut. 6. 13. & 10. 12, 20. & 11. 13. Joſh. 24. 15. Judg. 10. 16. Dan 6. 20. *per vocem* δουλεύειν *reddiderunt* Deut. 13. 4. Judg. 2. 7. 1 Sam. 7. 3. & 12. 11, 20, 24. 1 King. 16. 31. 1 Chron. 28. 9. Pſal. 2. 11. & 100. 1. *cum multis aliis. Laurent. Valla. in Annot. ſuis in c. 4. Matthæ. Evang. fuſe probat nihil intereſſe inter* δουλεύειν & λατρεύειν, *idque fretus authoritate principium Græcorum.*

Here let it be farther conſidered, that the Adoration and Invocation of Saints and Angels in the Church of *Rome*, is not only Idolatrous, but it is in imitation of the old Pagan Idolatry, and a manifeſt reviving of their Doctrines of *Dæmons*, which is foretold in Scripture as that which ſhould fall out in the laſt days amongſt the degenerate and apoſtatizing Chriſtians. So the Apoſtle tells us in 1 *Tim.* 4. 12. *That in the latter times ſome ſhall revolt from the Faith, giving head to ſeducing Spirits, and* (διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων) *Doctrines of Devils, or Dæmons*; that is, (c) Doctrines which they are Objects, rather than Authors of. Doctrines concerning *Dæmons*, as *Doctrines of Baptiſm and of laying on of hands, and of the Reſurrection of the Dead, and of Eternal Judgment*, are Doctrines about and concerning all theſe. Now what theſe *Dæmons* were, and what the Heathens Doctrine about them was, may be read at large in *Mede*'s Apoſtaſie of the Latter Times, (a Book which the Papiſts

(c) *The Genitive* δαιμονίων, *is to be taken paſſively for the Object of theſe Doctrines. See the like* Heb. 6. 2. Act. 13. 12. Tit. 2. 10. Gal. 2. 20. *Joſ. Mede.*

Papists never cared to meddle with) there the Author hath made it manifest, that the *Gentiles* Idolatry, and Theology of *Dæmons*, is reviv'd and re-inforc'd in the Church of *Rome*. They fancied that their *Dæmons* were an inferiour sort of Deified Powers, that stood in the midst between the Sovereign gods and them. The Sovereign gods they supposed so sublime and pure, that Mortals could not, might not approach to them: therefore they introduced this middle sort of Divine Powers to be as Mediators and Agents betwixt them. * These *Dæmons* or Mediators were supposed to be of two sorts, some were the souls of men who were Deified after their death; the Canonizing of *Heroes* and deceased Worthies is ancient indeed, 'tis older than the Papacy: *Rome* when 'twas Heathen had a custom to Canonize their deceased Emperours, and call them *Divi* or Saints too. We read of *Divus Augustus* as well as of *Divus Augustinus*. Another sort of *Dæmons* (d) they had, *which were more sublime, which never dwelt in mortal bodies, but were from the beginning always the same.* This second sort of *Dæmons* doth fitly answer to those Spiritual Powers we call Angels, as the former sort doth to those which with us are called Saints. To these *Dæmons* they built Temples; their Images, Shrines and Reliques, they religiously adored: so that in many respects the Pagan Idolatry was a pattern of the Popish Idolatry, the one is exactly parallel with the other, it hath a great affinity to it, and its very foundation from it. I know that it will be objected that those *Dæmons* or inferiour Deities of the Heathens were the souls of wicked Men and Devils, whereas those who are invocated and adored by the Romanists are the Spirits of just Men and Angels. To which I answer, That though in that respect there be a disparity, yet the Objection hath no force, because the Idolatry of the Heathen did not lie in making an ill choice of the *Dæmons* they worshipped, but in giving that religious Worship to a Creature which was due only to the Creator. Let him be a good or a bad Angel, a just or a wicked person, so long as he is a Creature, 'tis Idolatry to defer religious Worship or Invocation to him.

* *Platonici opinantur quod Dæmones Mediatores Sanct. inter Deos & homines per quos ad Deorum amicitias homines ambiant.* V. Aug. de civit. Dei, L. 9. c. 9. c. 11.

Divi qui Cœlestes semper habiti, & qui in cœlum vocati. Cic. de legibus, l. 2.

(d) *Plutarch. de defect. oracul. Apuleius. Sanctius est & superius aliud, augustiusque Dæmonum genus, qui semper a corporis compedibus & noxibus liberi. Ex hac sublimiori Dæmonum copia autumat Plato singulis hominibus in vita agenda testes & custodes singulos additos.*

Æneas Patrem defunctum invocat. Nunc pateras libate Jovi precibusque vocate Anchisen genitorem.

Before I conclude this point, let me give you the opinion of one of their own way upon this matter: his words are these: (e) *Many Christians do for the most part transgress in a good thing, that they worship the Divos Divasque non aliter venerantur quam Deum nec video in multis quid sit discrimen inter eorum opinionem de Sanctis, & id quod Gentiles putabant de Diis suis.* Lud. vir. notis in Aug. de civit. Dei, l. 8. c. 27. Edit. An. 1596.

(e) *Multi Christiani in re bona plerumque peccant, quod*

He-Saints and She-Saints no otherwiſe than they worſhip God; nor do I ſee in many things wherein their opinion of the Saints doth differ from that which the Heathen had of their gods. What Proteſtant Heretick could have ſpoken more plainly? To carry on the alluſion, conſider how the Heathen had their Tutelar gods for Countries and Cities; in like manner the Papiſts have their Saint-Patrons for particular Places and Nations; as * *St. George for England, St. Patrick for Ireland, S. David for Wales, St. James for Spain, St. Dennis for France*, &c. The Heathen did appropriate particular Employments and Offices to their *Dæmons* or Deities; ſo do the Papiſts to their He and She-Saints: only (as one obſerves) the Superſtition and folly of new *Rome* in this exceeds that of the old, that they could content themſelves, with *Æſculapius*, only in all matters that related to Phyſick and Diſeaſes, but theſe have almoſt as many Saints to invoke, as there are Maladies to be cured; one Saint is good for ſore Breaſts (*g*), another for the Tooth-ach (*h*), a third for Feavers (*i*), a fourth for Inflammations (*k*), and ſo on. Nay, in ſome caſes they will not truſt themſelves in the hands of one Saint alone; as for inſtance, in caſe of the Peſtilence they join St. *Roch* with St. *Sebaſtian* for ſurer aid. The Heathen were wont to invoke *Lucina* in the Pains of Childbirth, but the Papiſts think St. *Margaret* to be the better Midwife; and St. *Nicholas* now in their eſteem hath as much, or more power in the Seas than ever *Neptune* had.

* *ut Martem Latii ſic nos te dive Georgi Mantuan.*

(*g*) S. Agatha.
(*h*) S Apollonia.
(*i*) S. Sigiſmund.
(*k*) S. Anthony

4. This practice is injurious unto Chriſt. It intrencheth upon his Mediatory Office, and doth manifeſtly rob him of his (*l*) Royal Prerogative, which is to be the one, and only Mediator betwixt God and man. Hear what the Apoſtle ſays, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Chriſt Jeſus.* One excluſively, one, and but one. In this Office Chriſt hath no Sharers or Partners. As God is but one, and there is no other; ſo the Mediator is but one, and there is no other. The Papiſts may as well fancy many ſubordinate gods, as ſubordinate Mediators betwixt him and us. I am not ignorant of their diſtinction, how that there is but one *Mediator of Redemption*, but there are and may be many *Mediators of Interceſſion*. To which I anſwer, That the Scripture knows no ſuch difference or diſtinction of Mediators; and in Chriſt they are one and the ſame thing; in this he intercedes that he hath ſatisfied for us, and 'tis in conſideration of his death that God receives us into his favour. And if the diſtinction be admitted, the word *between* (in the Text forecited) doth evidently ſhew that he rather ſpeaks of a Mediator of Interceſſion: for 'tis improper to ſay that Chriſt is a Redeemer between God and man;

'Tis injurious to Chriſt.

(*l*) *Quid tam proprium Chriſti quam advocatum apud Deum patrem adſtare populorum,* Ambroſ. in Pſal. 39. *Pro quo nullus interpellat ſed ipſe pro omnibus, hic unus verusque Mediator eſt,* Aug. cont. parmen. L. 2. c 8. *And in the ſame place; The mutual prayers, ſaith he, of all the Members, which yet labour upon the earth, ought to aſcend up to the Head, which is gone before into Heaven, in whom we have the remiſſion of our ſins. For if St.* Paul *were a Mediator, the other Apoſtles would be ſo alſo, and ſo there would be many Mediators, which would not agree with that which elſewhere he ſaith, That there is one Mediator between God and man.*

and

and yet that we may know that he doth not intercede for us only by his Prayers, but by his Paſſion and Merits alſo, 'tis added, *That he gave himſelf a ranſom for us:* and in the 1 *John* 2. 1. when Jeſus Chriſt the righteous is ſpoken of as our *Advocate*, 'tis preſently added, that *He is the propitiation for our ſins*; which ſhews that his Interceſſion conſiſts in his being a propitiation *for ſin*. *The High Prieſt* under the Law was a Figure or Type of Chriſt in this reſpect, for he was Typically a Mediator both of Interceſſion and Redemption. There was no other ordinary Mediator of Interceſſion but he; and hence it is that he went alone into the Holy of Holies to offer up Incenſe unto God; he had no Partners with him in his Office. So Jeſus Chriſt is entred alone into the Holy Place not made with hands, to wit, Heaven it ſelf, to appear in the preſence of God for us. In the Tabernacle of this World, (as it was in the firſt Tabernacle) there you may happily find many Prieſts whom you may employ as Agents for you with God; but in the ſecond Tabernacle, which is Heaven, there is but one High Prieſt that hath to do in that Holy Place, but one Agent do deal with God for you. There is but one Advocate admitted into that Court to appear for you, and plead your Cauſe. 'Tis neceſſary for the conſtituting of an Advocate or Interceſſor for us in Heaven, that he be Commiſſionated and Deputed by God unto that Office; he muſt not arrogate or take it upon himſelf, unleſs he be called thereunto. Now this Qualification doth ſuit with Chriſt and no other; no Saint or Angel had ever any Commiſſion or Deputation from God for this ſervice; to which of the Angels or Saints did he ever ſay, *Sit thou at my right hand*, receive the Devotions and Petitions of Sinners on Earth, and preſent them to me in Heaven? I have read indeed that Angels are deputed to be their Guardians and Miniſters, but not to be their Advocates and Mediators.

One thing I would add which deſerves our Conſideration, that theſe Popiſh Diſtinguiſhers do make the Saints in Heaven to be their Mediators of Redemption, as well as Interceſſion: for no Petition is more frequent in their Offices to the Saints, than that by their Merits, as well as Prayers, they might obtain ſuch and ſuch bleſſings here, and eternal Life hereafter. If it would not tire you, I could treat you with many ſcores of inſtances: For a taſte, let me give you a piece of a Prayer to one *Etheldred* an Engliſh Saint, and 'tis in theſe words: (m) *Look, O moſt Gracious Virgin, upon our troubles which we deſervedly ſuſtain, and by the Merits and Interceſſion of thy holineſs, both appeaſe the anger of the Judge whom we have offended, and obtain that pardon which we have not deſerved.* But above all, commend me to one of our Country-folk, and that is the honeſt man I named before, even St. *Thomas Becket*, whoſe blood they ſuppoſed of old to be as Sovereign as Chriſt's himſelf. 'Tis

(m) *O omnes Sancti & Sanctæ Dei ſubvenite mihi, &c. ut per merita veſtra pervenire valeam ad æternæ beatitudinis patriam.*

Horæ ſec. uſ. Rom. Per tuæ Sanctitatis merita & interceſſiones iram judicis placa quam offendimus. Brev. Sarum, fol. 100.

not.

not enough to pray (as they do) *that by* (n) *his Merits and Prayers they may be tranſlated from Vice to Virtues, and from the Priſon to the Kingdom*; this they hope for from more ordinary Saints: but as for St. *Thomas*, they pray, (o) that *by his Blood they may climb to Heaven, as he has done before them.* Now judge by what hath been ſaid, if the Saints be not made Mediators of Redemption, as well as Interceſſion.

(n) *Te ſupplices exoramus ut ejus meritis & precibus a vitiis ad virtutes, & a carcere tranſferamur ad regnum.* Brev. Sar. in Tranſl. Tho. 7 Julii.

(o) *Tu per Thomæ ſanguinem quem pro te impendit, fac nos Chriſte ſcandere qua Thomas aſcendit.*

By that ſame Blood *Thomas* for thee expended,
Chriſt, raiſe us thither whither he's aſcended.

Jeſu Chriſte per Thomæ vulnera,
Quæ nos ligant relaxa ſcelera,
Ne captivos ferant ad infera,
Hoſtis Mundus vel carnis opera.

Deus patitur ſe miſericorditer reconciliari propter merita & interceſſiones Sanctorum, Colonienſ. in ſuo Antidotagm.

I ſhall have done with this Head, when I have obſerved one thing more, (for the ſake of which I ſhall never be reconciled to *Rome*) that is, they don't only degrade our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and bring in Partners upon him in his Office of Interceſſion, but they diſparage him too, and report that * he being a Judge as well as an Advocate, is more inclined to ſeverity; that we may expect more pity and compaſſion from his Mother, and the other Saints, who are more diſpoſed to mercy than he is. Yea, I have underſtood that in ſome of their Churches they have pictured Chriſt frowning and caſting darts at ſinners, whom they make to flee from him as if they were afraid of him; and then the Virgin *Mary* is brought in as ſhrowding of them, and interpoſing betwixt him and them. Oh unparallel'd wickedneſs! Oh ye vile and wretched Papiſts! Have you never read what is reported of Chriſt in the Scriptures of Truth? that *he is a merciful and faithful High Prieſt*, one that hath *compaſſion on poor ſinners, as having himſelf been touch't with the feeling of their Infirmities.* Is this your dealing with him, to diſgrace as well as to diſplace him? What mean your great Doctors by telling the World, that the Interceſſion of the Saints is more available than his? that (p) as he wrought greater Miracles by the Saints than by himſelf, ſo often-times he ſheweth the force of their Interceſſion more than his own. What was his meaning who upon this Queſtion, (Whether it be better to pray to God by Chriſt alone, or by the Saints?) determined it thus, *Oratio fuſa per Sanctos melior eſt*, 'tis better to do it by the Saints? But 'tis time to conclude this part of my Diſcourſe, which was to prove, the practice of the Church of *Rome* in praying

* *Chriſtus non ſolum advocatus eſt ſed & judex cuncta diſcuſſurus, ita quod nihil inultum remanebit. Cum itaque vix juſtus ante eum ſit ſecurus, quomodo peccator ante eum tanquam advocatum accederet? Ideo Deus providit nobis de Advocata, quæ mitis & ſuavis eſt in qua nihil invenitur aſperum.* Antonin. part. 4. *ſummæ Titul.* 15.

(p) *Hen. Fitz. of the Maſs, l. 2. part. 2. c. 3. Salmer. in Ep. 1. ad Tim. c. 2.*

praying to Saints and Angels to be blame-worthy and abominable in the ſight of God.

It remains now that I examine the Pleas the Papiſts have for this practice. You'll ſuppoſe they have ſomething to ſay for themſelves in this behalf, and ſo they have. I ſhall not wittingly conceal any thing of force, which is urged or pleaded by them. You have underſtood already that they don't pretend the warrant of God's Word for their ſo doing. Thoſe of them that have endeavoured to find this practice in the Scripture, have fumbled ſo lamentably that others of their own party are aſhamed of them. Who can forbear ſmiling to hear it inferr'd, that becauſe the rich man prayed Father *Abraham* to ſend *Lazarus* to his aid, therefore 'tis lawful to invocate the Saints, and to deſire their aſſiſtance? There is one Text of Scripture which ſeems to patronize the Invocation of Angels, and 'tis ſtrongly urged by ſome upon that account, and that is in *Gen.* 48. 16. there *Jacob* ſays, *The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bleſs the Lads.* Theſe words of *Jacob* (ſays a learned Writer) are not ſpoken to an Angel, but of or concerning an Angel (*q*), and the ſpeech is (ἄγγελος not προσάγγελος) by way of wiſh or option, not by way of prayer or ſupplication. But the true anſwer is this, That by the Angel in that place we are not to underſtand (*Angelus Domini*, but *Angelus Dominus*) an Angel of the Lord, but the Angel that is the Lord. (*r*) The Lord himſelf goes under that Name in Scripture, He's called the *Angel of the Covenant*, and the *Counſel of God.* The Lord was the Angel with whom *Jacob* before had wreſtled, and he was the Angel whom *Jacob* here invocated. He prayed him to bleſs his Nephews, to whom he had ſaid a little before, *I will not let thee go unleſs thou bleſs me*, and that was not a created Angel, but Jeſus Chriſt the Creator of Angels. (*ſ*) The ſame Jeſus is the Angel ſpoken of *Rev.* 8. 3. who is ſaid there, *to ſtand at the Altar with a Golden Cenſor, and to have much Incenſe given him that he ſhould offer it with the Prayers of all Saints upon the Golden Altar which was before the Throne:* This muſt be underſtood of our High Prieſt the Lord Jeſus Chriſt: It is He only that offereth or preſenteth our Prayers with the Incenſe of his Merits upon the Golden Altar, *i. e.* upon himſelf, unto God for a ſweet ſmelling ſavour (*t.*)

But what they want in the Scripture, they ſay they have in the Writings of the ancient Fathers for the juſtifying of this practice. (*u*) *Bellarmine* ſays, that all the Fathers, *Greek* and *Latine*, teach that the Saints are to be invocated. (*w*) *Salmeron*, (*x*) *Stapleton*, and others ſpeak the ſame Language. Theſe kind of men, ſays Biſhop *Uſher*, *have ſo*

Popiſh Pleas for Invocation of Saints.

(*q*) *Montague* in Treat. of Invocation of Saints, p. 87.

(*r*) Mal. 3. 1. Iſai. 63. 9.

(*ſ*) V. Athan. orat. 4. cont. Arrian. p. 260. *The Patriarch Jacob joined none with God but him only who is the word, whom for this cauſe he called Angel, becauſe it is he alone who manifeſteth the Father to us.* Irræneus, Ambroſe, Rupertus, Viega,

Haymo, &c. of this mind. (*t*) Epheſ. 5. 2. Heb. 4. 14. & 9. 14. & 13. 10, 15. *No created Angel is ſufficient for this, to receive and offer up the Prayers of all Saints.* (*u*) *Omnes Patres Græci & Latini docent Sanctos eſſe invocandos.* Bell. de Eccl. Triump. l. 1. c. 6. (*w*) Salmer. *in* 1 Tim. 2. diſp. 7. (*x*) Stapler. fortr. p. 1. c. 9. Jo. Azor. Inſt. Moral. Tom. 1. Lib. 9. c. 10.

inured

inured their Tongues to talk of the Fathers, and all the Fathers, that they can hardly uſe any other form of ſpeech; and having told ſuch tales as theſe ſo often over, at laſt they perſwade themſelves they are true indeed. The ſame learned perſon in his Anſwer to a Challenge made by a Jeſuite in *Ireland*, hath this paſſage: *However our Challenger* (ſays he) *gives it out, that Prayer to Saints was of great account amongſt the Fathers of the Primitive Church for the firſt four hundred years after Chriſt, yet for nine parts of that time I dare be bold to ſay, that he is not able to produce as much as one teſtimony out of any Father whereby it may appear that any account at all was made of it:* Nay, he makes it evident they were all againſt it. They that are deſirous to be farther informed in this matter, may do well to conſult his Quotations out of the ancient Fathers, which he hath faithfully given his Reader, and there he will find them in words at length. (z) The like good ſervice is done to my hand by others. I could, if there were room for it, fill many Pages with appoſite Teſtimonies and Citations, but that would ſwell this Diſcourſe too much. Take two or three for a taſte.

(z) *V. Dallæi diſput. adverſ. Latin. de cultus religioſi objecto traditionem, L. 3. & p.* 340. *ad p.* 582. *Pet. du Moulin de novitate Papiſmi. Dr.* Ferne's *Anſwer to* Spencer, *Sect.* 2. *from p.* 257. *to p.* 285. John Polyander's *Refutation of a Popiſh Epiſtle concerning the Invocation of Saints. Exam. Concilii Tridentini per Martin Chemnitium, Juellum contra Hardingum, Whitaker contra Duræum,&c.*

Ignatius (who flouriſht about the 140 year of our Lord) in his Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians*, thus writes: (a) *You Virgins have none but Jeſus Chriſt alone before your eyes in your Prayers, and the Father of Jeſus Chriſt.* It ſeems that Chriſtians in his time did not ſo much as look to, or call upon the Virgin *Mary* her ſelf. To the ſame purpoſe is that of *Origen*, (b) *We muſt pray to him alone who is God above all things. To him alſo we muſt pray, who is the Word, the only Son of God, and the firſt-born of all Creatures.* The Writings of that Father are full of evident Teſtimonies againſt this practice, but I have promiſed brevity; only let me add this paſſage of his, *That we ought not to worſhip our fellow-worſhippers*, to pray *to thoſe that pray themſelves. Athanaſius* wrote as much as he about this matter, and his contending with the *Arrians* gave him occaſion for it: They maintained that Chriſt was a meer Creature, and yet they prayed to him; and he on the contrary aſſerted, That if he were created, he muſt not be invocated. (c) *To God alone,*

(a) Αἱ παρθένοι μόναν τὸν Κύριον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχετε, καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα. Ignat. Ep. 6.

(b) Μόνῳ προσευκτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ προσευκτέον τε τῷ μονογενεῖ, καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ πάσης κτίσεως λόγῳ Θεοῦ. Tom. 8. cont. Celſum, p. 395. V. eodem libro, p. 381, 384, 402, 416, 420 & Tom. 5. cont. Celſum, l. 8. in Epiſt. ad Rom. c. 10

(c) Τῷ Θεῷ δεῖ μόνῳ προσεύχεσθαι καὶ τοῦτο ἴσασι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγγελοι, &c. in orat. 3. cont. Arrian. V. orat. 4. Origen l. 8. cont. Celſum, p. 432, 433. hath this paſſage, which for the greater profit to ſome Readers I put into Engliſh. *If* Celſus *will have us to procure the good will of any others after him that is God over all, let him conſider, that as when the body is moved, the ſhadow thereof doth follow it; ſo in like manner having God propitious to us, who is over all, it followeth that we ſhall have all his friends, both Angels and Saints, loving to us, for they have a fellow-feeling with them that are thought fit to find favour with God. Neither are they only favourable unto ſuch, but they work with them alſo that are willing to do ſervice unto him, who is God over all, and are friendly to them, and pray and intreat with them: ſo as we boldly ſay, that when men which with reſolution propoſe unto themſelves the beſt things, do pray unto God, many thouſands of the ſacred powers pray together with them unſpoken to.* Ἀλλὰ συνεύχεται. V. Cyril. in Joan. c. 16.

ſaith

saith he, *it belongeth to be worshipped, and the Angels themselves are not ignorant hereof: for although they excel in Glory, yet they are Creatures, and are none of those that are worshipped, but of those that worship the Lord.* And again, *Because Jesus Christ is not a Creature, but is begotten of the very substance of the Father, and is by Nature the Son of God, therefore is he worshipped.*

So much for Greek Fathers, the Latine Fathers were of the same mind. *Tertullian*, who lived about the beginning of the third Century, he tells us, (d) *That such and such things he might not pray for from any other but from him of whom he knew he should obtain them, because it is he who alone is able to give, and I am he for whom they must be obtained, being his servant who observe him alone.* *Novatianus*, (whose Book of the Trinity is added to *Tertullian*'s Works) he says, (e) *If Christ be only a man, why is a man called upon in our Prayers as a Mediator? seeing that the invocation of a man is judged of no efficacy to Salvation. Why also is hope reposed in him, seeing hope in man is accursed?* And again, *If Christ be only man, how is he present being called upon every where? seeing this is not the nature of man, but of God, that he can be present at every place.* *Ambrose* in his Funeral Oration upon *Theodosius* the Emperour, hath this passage, (f) *Thou alone, O Lord, art to be invocated, Thou art to be intreated to make up the want of him in his Sons.* *Augustine* in his Confessions thus prays unto God, (g) *I confess and know my soul is defiled, but who shall cleanse it? or to whom else should I cry besides thee?* And again, (h) *Whom should I find that might reconcile me unto thee? Should I have gone to the Angels? with what Prayer? with what Sacraments? Many endeavouring to return unto thee, and not being able to do it by themselves, as I hear, have tried these things, and have fallen into the desire of curious Visions, and were accounted worthy of Delusions.* The same Father asserts, (i) *That in the Catholick Church it is divinely and singularly delivered, That no Creature is to be worshipped by the soul, but he only who is the Creator of all things.* And again, (k) *Jesus Christ is the Priest, who being now entred within the Vail, alone there, of them that have been partakers of flesh, doth make Intercession for us; in figure of which thing, amongst that first People, and in that first Temple, the Priest only did enter into the*

(d) *Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam a quo me Scio consecuturum, quoniam & ipse est qui solum præstat, &c.* Apologetic. c. 30.

(e) *Si homo tantum modo Christus, quommodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit, &c.* De Trinitate, c. 14.

(f) *Tu solus Domine invocandus es, tu rogandus ut eum in filiis repræsentes.*

(g) *Habit Anima quæ offendant oculos tuos, sed quis mundabit eam? aut cui alteri præter te clamabo.* Confess. l. 1. c. 5.

(h) *Quem invenirem qui me reconciliaret tibi? an eundum mihi fuit ad Angelos? qua prece? quibus Sacramentis? Multi conantes ad te redire, neque per seipsos valentes, sicut audio, tentaverunt hæc & inciderunt in desiderium curiosarum visionum, & digni habiti sunt illusionibus.* Confess. L. 10 c. 42.

(i) *Divine & singulariter in Ecclesia Catholica traditur, nullam Creaturam colendam esse animæ sed ipsum tantummodo rerum omnium Creatorem,* De quantit. Animæ, c. 34.

(k) *Christus Sacerdos est qui nunc ingressus in interiora veli, solus ibi ex his qui carnem gestaverunt interpellat pro nobis; in cujus rei figura in illo primo Populo, & in illo primo Templo unus Sacerdos intrabat in Sancta Sanctorum, populus omnis foras stabat,* in Psalm 64.

Holy of Holies, and all the people stood without. Once more, (l) The worshipping (says he) of men that are dead, should be no part of our Religion, because if they lived piously, they will not seek that kind of honour; they are to be honoured therefore for Imitation, not to be adored for Religion.

(l) *Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum quia si pie vixerunt tales non quærant honores, &c.*

Honorandi ergo sunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem. Aug. de vera religione, c. 55. *Qui supplicant mortuis rationem hominum non tenent.* Lact. Instit. divin. l. 2. c. 18.

These are some of those many Testimonies which are found in the Writings of the Ancients. I shall add but one more saying of him whom I last mentioned, (and it's worth our notice:) (m) *The Prayer* (says he) *which is not made by Jesus Christ, not only cannot blot out sin, but it self also is sin.* If any shall say that there are some passages in *Ambrose*, *Austin*, and other Writers near that Age, that favour this opinion or practice of invocating Saints: I answer, That if it be granted, we may gather this from it, That meer Humane Writings are no Foundation of our Faith, nor can any certainty be had from those who speak or write with such inconstancy. * Farther it is confest, that towards the end of the fourth Century, this Leaven diffused it self in the Church. The occasion mainly (as some upon good grounds affirm) was this. The Christians of those times did greatly reverence the memory of the Martyrs, and did often resort to their Sepulchres, and there offered up their Prayers unto that God for whose Cause they laid down their Lives. And because God was pleased to give gracious answers to those Prayers, and to do many wonderful things for the honouring of that Christian Profession, which those Worthies maintained unto the death; therefore some began to imagine that all this was done at their suit and mediation: yea, some affirmed that the Martyrs themselves appeared to divers that were relieved at the places of their Memorials. He that would see more of the rise of this practice, let him consult *Chemnicius*

(m) *Oratio quæ non sit per Christum non solum non potest delere peccatum, sed etiam ipsa sit peccatum,* in Psal. 108.

* *Besides, their Writings are corrupted by the Romanists, and many spurious and supposititious sayings are fathered upon the Fathers; of which I could give many instances, and some in this very case. The deifying and invocating of Saints began to appear in the Church somewhat early, the grounds whereof were most strange reports of wonders shewed upon those who approached the Shrines of Martyrs, and prayed at their Memories and Sepulchres. Devils charmed, Diseases cured, the Blind saw, the Lame walkt, yea the Dead revived, &c. which the Doctors of those times avouched to be done by the power and prayers of the glorified Martyrs, and by the notice they took of mens devotions at their Sepulchres; though at first those devotions were directed to God alone, and such places only chosen for the stirring up of zeal and fervour. But whiles the world stood in admiration of these wonders, men were soon perswaded to call on those Martyrs as Patrons and Mediators, by whose power with God, and notice of things done on earth, they thought that these signs and miracles appeared. Mede's* Apostasie of the latter times. Circa A. D. 370. per Basil. Nyssen. Nazianz invoc. Sanct. *in publicos Ecclesiæ conventus invehi cœpit. Hi primi fuerunt qui tam ex privatis & Monachorum devotionibus in Ecclesiam invexerunt. Cum enim in Rhetorum Scholis tractati, eloquentiæ laudem affectarent, orationes panegyricas declamatoriis flosculis & Rhetoricis Apostrophis, & quæ cæterea ad figuram ῥητορικὴν pertinent, ita exornarunt, ut opinionem, de comprecationibus & auxiliis Sanctorum, quæ Origenis tempore apocrypha & privata erant, tanquam publicum dogma in immensum exaggerarent, & ad compellationes eorum, quoniam memoriam celebrabant, orationes convertarent; atque ita figuram orationis ad formam invocationis declinarent. Cujus tamen exempla nec ex Scriptura, nec ex vetustiori & puriori Ecclesia habebant. Circa Augustini tempora materia illa invoc. Sanctorum incidit in ætatem, qui invocationes Musarum, Dæmonum & Heroum poetica imitatione & licentia ad Martyres transtulerunt.* Circa A. D. 600. addita & inserta erat Litaniæ a Greg. Magno. V. plura in Chemnic. Exam. C. Trid.

in

in his judicious Examination of the Council of *Trent*. The progress of it, together with the opposition it met with in the Church of God, is not unknown to those that have lookt into the History of those times. Although therefore the Popish invocation of Saints be ancient in respect of some of their other Innovations, yet 'tis novel in its self, and in respect of true Antiquity. I shall conclude this Head, when I have shewd you, that not only particular Fathers, but whole Councils have condemn'd the practice in question. The Council of * *Carthage* was against the invocation of Saints, and the Council of *Laodicea* did censure the invocation of Angels. In the 35 Canon of that Council, it was thus determined: (n) *That Christians ought not to leave the Church of God, and go and call upon Angels, and make Meetings, which are things forbidden. If any man therefore be found giving himself to this secret Idolatry, let him be accurſed; becauſe he hath forſaken the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, and hath applied himſelf to Idolatry.* Theodoret (in his Expoſition of the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*) doth twice mention this Canon, and declare the ſenſe of it. Upon *Col.* 3. 17. (o) *The Apoſtle* (ſaith he) *commandeth to adorn our words and deeds with the Commemoration of our Lord Chriſt, and to ſend up Thankſgiving to God and the Father by him, and not by the Angels. The Synod of* Laodicea *following alſo this Rule, and deſiring to heal that old Diſeaſe,* (viz. Angel-worſhip) *made a Law that they ſhould not pray unto Angels, nor forſake our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And on Col. 2. he adds, (p) *That this vice continued long in* Phrygia *and* Piſidia, *for which cauſe the Synod (aſſembled in* Laodicea *the chief City of* Phrygia) *forbad them by a Law to pray unto Angels; and even to this day among them and their borderers, there are Oratories of St.* Michael *to be ſeen.* (q) *Oecumenius* after him hath much the ſame words upon the ſame place.

* Concil. Carthag. 3.

(n) Οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανὸς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπιέναι, καὶ ἀγγέλους ἐπονομάζειν· καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν ἀπηγορεύθαι, &c. Concil. Laodic. Can. 35.

(o) Τοῦτο ἐπιτηδεύσαντες τὸν νόμον ἔθεντο καὶ ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ σύνοδος Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ ἐκείνῳ πάθει θεραπεῦσαι βουλόμενοι, ἐνομοθέτησαν μὴ δεῖν εὔχεσθαι ἀγγέλοις, καὶ κατάλαμπάνειν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. In Col. 3. 17. Conſule eundem in cap. 2. ult.

(p) Ἔμεινε δὲ τοῦτο κατὰ Φρυγίαν τὸ πεσσύνειν ἀγγέλοις, καὶ πεσσεύχεσθαι, &c. (q) Oecumen. S. in Col. 2. V. Not. ad Origenis Libros cont. Celſum, p. 483. Auguſtine *calls thoſe Hereticks that were inclined to the worſhip of Angels,* De Hæreſ. c. 39. Epiphanius *ſpeaks of a ſort of Hereticks (called* Collyridians) *from the* Collyrides, *or Cakes, which they uſed to offer to the Virgin* Mary. *Theſe he at large refutes, and ſays that neither* Elias, *nor* John, *nor* Thecla, *nor any of the Saints is to be worſhipped. And again, God will not have the Angels to be worſhipped, much leſs her that was born of* Anna. *And again, Which of the Prophets have permitted a man to be worſhipped, that I may not ſay a woman? The bleſſed Virgin is a choice Veſſel indeed, but yet a woman. Let* Mary *be in honour, but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, be worſhipped.* Τῷ Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνήτω, *Let no man worſhip* Mary. *Again,* Μὴ φαγέτω τις, &c. *Let none eat of this errour touching holy* Mary; *for although the tree be beautiful, yet it is not for meat: And although* Mary *be moſt excellent, and holy, and to be honoured; yet ſhe is not to be worſhipped. Again, She was indeed a Virgin, and honourable, and not given to us for adoration, but one who did her ſelf worſhip him, who was born of her in the fleſh.* Epiphan. Hæreſ. 79. p. 446, 447, 448. *There alſo he exhorteth Chriſtians to put on a man-like mind, and to beat down γυναικῶν μανίαν ταύτην, the madneſs of theſe women. For it ſeems in thoſe days it was the womens Hereſie, though now it hath obtained amongſt the Romaniſts, both males and females.* Gregory Nyſſen *againſt* Eunomius, l. 5. *hath this excellent paſſage; we are taught to underſtand, that whatſoever is created is a different thing from the Divine Nature; and that we are to worſhip and adore* Μόνον τὸ ἄκτιστον οὖσαν, *that Nature only which is uncreated, whoſe character is this, That it neither at any time began to be, nor ever ſhall ceaſe to be. The Spaniſh Inquiſitors,* Anno 1584. *took care the word* (only) *ſhould be blotted out.* Chryſoſtom *in his third Homily on the firſt Chapter to the* Hebrews, *hath this ſaying; why do you gape after Angels? they are ſer-*

vants to the Son of God, and are sent to divers places for our sakes. And Hom. 18. *on the Epistle to the* Romans, *he says, unto whom shalt thou flee? whom wilt thou call upon to fight for, and help thee? shall it be to* Abraham? *but he will not hear thee. Shall it be to these Virgins? but they also shall impart none of their Oyl unto thee. Shalt thou call upon thy Father or thy Grandfather? but none of them is able to release or relieve thee. These things considered, worship and pray to him alone who hath the power to blot out thine Obligation, and quench that flame. Again,* Hom. 9. *on the Epistle to the* Colossians, *he tells us, That the Devil envying the honour we have to address our selves to God immediately, hath brought in the service of Angels. The Ancients were generally of opinion, that the Saints are not admitted into Heaven, and a clear sight of God, till the last day; this is confest by* Stapleton, Defens. Eccl. Author. cont. Whitak. l. 1. c. 2. Tertullian, *(says he)* Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Ambrose, Clemens, Romanus, Bernard, &c. *did not assent unto this sentence, which now is defined as a Doctrine of Faith, That the souls of the righteous enjoy the sight of God before the day of Judgment, but did deliver the contrary sentence thereunto. And if so, they could not be of opinion, by* Bellarmine's *own Concessions, that men on earth should invocate them, as the Romanists now do.* V. Origen. in Rom. l. 2. p. 471. Aug. Tom. 8. in Psal. 36.

Seeing then the Scripture, and the ancient Fathers, are no Friends to this Popish Invocation now in question; I am the less concerned about those other reasons which they sometimes urge in behalf of it. Nevertheless I shall consider those that are most considerable, that seem to have the greatest force in them.

Arg. 1. They argue from the lawfulness of desiring the Prayers of just men here on Earth: this is, they say, our daily practice; nothing is more ordinary than to intreat the Prayers one of another: the Apostle writes to the *Romans*, *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, and desires to be assisted by their Prayers. Now if we may intreat the Prayers and Intercessions of just men on Earth, much more then of just men made perfect in Heaven.

Answ. 1. There is not the same reason for both; because the former is required and warranted by the Word of God, and not the latter. Again, the living may be made acquainted with our desires and wants, and not the dead; we have no way of informing them, or communicating our minds to them: they that suppose it, cannot agree (as was said before) about the way and manner of it. Other reasons may be assigned why living Christians should pray one for another, which won't hold in this case. Hereby they are made sensible of each others want, sufferings and infirmities; as also there is an increase of mutual and brotherly love, which is a necessary bond amongst Christians. But this is not all.

2. There is a vast disparity betwixt the Papists praying to the Saints in Heaven, and the Protestants desiring of the Prayers of just men here on Earth. This may easily be discerned by any that have not a mind to deceive, or to be deceived. When we desire others to pray with or for us, we don't make them the Object of Prayer and religious Invocation; nor do we reckon them as our Mediators, but as our fellow-suiters. See this in an instance. One man goes to his Minister, or godly Neighbour, and tells him his condition, and then desires him that he would strive together with him earnestly in Prayer to God for him,

him, that he may be ſupplied in the things that he ſtands in need of. Another applies himſelf to one that is in Heaven, (or it may be that he ſuppoſeth to be there) and with great devotion he proſtrates himſelf before him, (or it may be his Image) and then he prays, *Oh bleſſed St.* Francis *or St.* Dominick, *Look down upon thy poor Supplicant, take pity on me, a miſerable ſinner; I commend my body and ſoul to thee; aſſiſt me by thy merits, fill me with thy graces, bring me to everlaſting happineſs. Save me now and in the hour of death,* &c. I would fain know whether the practice of theſe two be one and the ſame: nay, whether there be any proportion or likeneſs betwixt the action of the one, and of the other. Take the holieſt man now living in the world, (and if you believe the Church of *Rome*, there be ſome that have holineſs enough, and to ſpare) and let this man have ſome of that religious Worſhip that is defer'd to their female (not to ſay their fictitious) Saints; as for inſtance, *St. Katharine, St. Margaret, St. Brigit, St. Barbara, St. Urſula*, or the like: that is to ſay, let a Temple be built, and an Altar erected to him, let his Image be ſet up, and the people enjoined to fall down before it, burn Incenſe to it, *&c.* let Vows and Supplications be made to him, and that in ſeveral places, and in the uſual forms: I ſay, let this, or ſomething like it, be done to the holieſt man living, and I am confident the Papiſts, yea the Pope and all his Cardinals would with one mouth condemn it, and ſay it were blame-worthy, and abominable.

Arg. 2. This practice argues reverence and humility; (r) 'tis pride and arrogance to make our addreſſes to God immediately. Here we ſeek to the King by the mediation of his Courtiers; much rather ſhould we go to God by the interceſſion of thoſe that are his Favourites in Heaven.

(r) *Petitio Dei per invocationem Sanctorum arguit majorem humilitatem, ſicut videre eſt in Centurione.* Salm. in 1 Tim. 2. Diſput. 7. Sect. ult.

Anſw. This pretence or ſhew of humility ſeems by that Text in *Col.* 2. 18. to have a main hand in the firſt introducing of Angel-Worſhip. And of this opinion is an ancient Writer, (ſ) who ſays, *They adviſed of old the Invocation of Angels upon this pretence, that the God of all things was inviſible and inacceſſible, and that it was fit we ſhould procure his favour by the means or mediation of Angels.* It was by this very Argument that the Gentiles of old defended their *Dæmon*-Worſhip. This I have already hinted, and an ancient Father doth plainly aſſert it, (t) *That the Heathen Idolaters, to cover the ſhame of their neglecting of God, were wont to uſe this miſerable excuſe, that by theſe they might go to God, as by Officers we go to the King.*

(ſ) Τοῦτο ἐπενόησαν τὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων τὸν Ἕλληνες ὑπόθεσιν πραγματεύσασθαι. Theodor. in Coloſſ. 2.

(t) *Solent tamen pudorem paſſi neglecti Dei miſera uti excuſatione, dicentes per iſtos poſſe ire ad Deum, ſicut per Comites pervenitur ad Regem.* Ambroſ. in c. 1. ad Romanos.

But the ſame Author proceeds to diſcover the vanity of this pretence.

I.

(u) *Age, nunquid tam demens eſt aliquis, aut ſalutis ſuæ immemor, ut honoriſcentiam Regis vindicet comiti? cum de hac re ſi qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur Majeſtatis. Et iſti ſe non putant reos qui honorem nominis Dei deſerunt Creaturæ, & relicto domino conſervos adorant, quaſi ſit aliquid plus quod ſervitur Deo. Nam & ideo ad Regem per Tribunos aut comites itur, quia homo utique eſt Rex, & neſcit quibus debeat rempub. credere. Ad Deum autem (quem utique nihil latet omnium enim merita novit) ſuffragatore non opus eſt, ſed mente devota.* Ambroſ. ibid.

I ſhall give you his own words: (u) *Go to,* (ſaith he) *is there any man ſo mad or unmindful of his Salvation, as to give the Kings honour to an Officer? Whereas if any ſhall be found but to treat of ſuch a matter, they are juſtly condemned as guilty of a great offence againſt the King. And yet theſe men think themſelves not guilty, who give the honour of God's Name to a Creature, and leaving the Lord, adore their fellow-ſervants, as though there were any thing more that could be reſerved to God. For therefore do men go to the King by Tribunes or Officers, becauſe the King is but a man, and knoweth not to whom he may commit the ſtate of the Commonwealth. But to procure the favour of God, (from whom nothing is hid, and who knows the works of all men) we need no Spokes-man, but a devout mind.*

When (ſays Chryſoſtom) *thou haſt need to ſue unto men, thou art forced firſt to deal with Door-keepers, and to intreat Paraſytes and Flatterers, and go a long way about; ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ἔστιν,* &c. *But with God there is no ſuch matter; without an Interceſſor he is intreated; without money, without coſt he yieldeth to thy prayer. It ſufficeth only that thou cry in thine heart, and bring tears with thee, and entring in ſtraightways thou mayſt draw him unto thee.* Serm. 7. de Pœnitent. Tom. 6. p. 802. Edit. Savil. *And in another place,* Ὅρα γυναικὸς Φιλοσοφίαν, &c. *Mark,* ſays he, *the Philoſophy or wiſdom of the woman of* Canaan, *ſhe intreateth not* James, *ſhe beſeecheth not* John, *neither doth ſhe come to* Peter; *but brake the whole company of them, ſaying, I have no need of a Mediator; but taking repentance with me for a Spokes-man, I come to the Fountain it ſelf. For this cauſe did he take fleſh, that I might take the boldneſs to ſpeak to him. I have no need of a Mediator; have thou mercy upon me.* In dimiſſun. Chanaan, Tom. 5. p. 195. Edit. Savil. *Again, in his fifth Sermon on the eighth of* Matth. *God* (ſaith he) *will not grant us ſo much of his grace at the requeſt of them which pray for us, as when we our ſelves pray unto him. ——— In praying for our ſelves we do more with God than when others pray for us. ——— He put off the* Canaanitiſh *woman when his Diſciples prayed for her, and heard her when ſhe her ſelf prayed, and ſaid,* Be it unto thee as thou wilt.

I ſhall conclude my Anſwer to this Plea of the Romaniſts, by propoſing one thing to their conſideration. Suppoſe a * King ſhould grant to all his Subjects, the poor as well as the rich, free acceſs to him, promiſing a redreſs of all their grievances upon the only mediation of the Prince his Son; and the Prince again ſhould by open Proclamation invite all freely to come to him, and proffer himſelf to be their Mediator, promiſing he will not in any wiſe reject the meaneſt of them. Would it be arrogance in any to accept of this offer? nay, would it not be the higheſt preſumption to take another courſe? to apply to the King by the mediation of this or the other Courtier? The caſe is the ſame here. But I haſten to the third and laſt Argument.

* *Si rex conſtituerit certum interceſſorem non volet ad ſe cauſas per alios deferri. Ita cum Chriſtus ſit conſtitutus Pontifex & Interceſſor, cur quærimus alios.* V. Auguſtin. l. 8. de Civitate Dei.

Phariſaica ſuperbia eſt vel noſtra vel aliorum hominum merita Deo in oratione opponere. Chemnic.

Arg. 3. The

Arg. 3. The third Argument is taken from the ſucceſs of ſuch Prayers. This is inſiſted on by a late Author, and he calls it, (w) *A convincing Argument. Certain it is* (ſaith he) *that many and great Miracles have been wrought by God upon Addreſſes made to the Saints, that thoſe who call upon them are heard, and obtain what they deſire.* He gives ſeveral inſtances, and if the Reader pleaſe, I'll tranſcribe one of them: 'tis a ſtory of what happened to one St. *John Damaſcen*, about the year 728. "He is known "(ſaith he) to have been a ſtout Aſſertor of "the Veneration of holy Images; and when "the Emperour *Leo Iſauricus* raiſed a Perſecu-"tion (ſo he calls it) for that cauſe, he wrote divers learned Epiſtles "to confirm the faithful in the Tradition of the Church. He was then "at *Damaſcus*, where the Prince of the *Saracens* kept his Court, and "highly in the favour of that Prince for his Wiſdom and Learning. "The Emperour *Leo*, not knowing otherwiſe how to execute his fury "againſt him, cauſes a Letter to be forged, as from *Damaſcen* to him, "and to be tranſcribed by one who could exactly imitate his hand: "the Contents whereof were to invite him to paſs that way with his "Army, with promiſe to deliver the City into his hands. This Letter "the Emperour (as out of friendſhip to an Ally, and deteſtation of "the Treachery) ſent to the Prince of the *Saracens*; who no ſooner "ſaw and read it, but in a brutiſh paſſion commanded the right hand "of *Damaſcen* (which he ſuppoſed had writ it) to be cut off. "*Dictum "Factum*, a Word and a Blow; his hand was ſtruck off, and hung up "in the Market-place till Evening, when upon petition that he might "have leave to bury it, it was commanded to be given him. He takes "the hand, and in ſtead of laying it in the ground, joins it to his Arm, "and proſtrating himſelf before an Image of our Bleſſed Lady, which "he kept in his Oratory, humbly beſought her interceſſion, for the re-"ſtoring of his hand, that he might imploy it in ſetting forth her Son's "praiſes, and hers. This done, ſleep ſeized on him, and he beheld "the Image of the Bleſſed Virgin looking upon him with a pleaſing "aſpect, and telling him that his hand was reſtored. Which when he "awaked he found to be true, and a ſmall circle or mark only remain-"ing in the place where it had been cut off, to teſtifie the truth of the "Miracle. This is recorded, it ſeems, by *John* Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, in the Life of this St. *John Damaſcen*.

(w) Cathol. no Idolat. p. 420, 424, 425. *Puella quædam obſeſſa, adducta fuit ad Capellam B. V. in antiqua Ottingen ubi cum litania cantaretur, & invocaretur miſerecordia auxilium & liberatio Dei Patris, Filii & S. S. Diabolus nihil fuit motus. Cum vero Lauret. Litania de B. Maria inchoaretur tum demum Satanas cœpit in obſeſſa turbari, clamare & furire. Mox vero Caniſius præſes, imagine B. Mariæ arrepta impoſuit capiti puellæ obſeſſæ, & tum Diab. cœpit exclamare. Ah mulier quid me calcas & caput meum conteris, &c.* Narratio Martini Hengerii.

Anſw. Do the Papiſts indeed think that this (and ſuch like pretty ſtories) is a good Foundation for the practice now in queſtion? What if a man ſhould be in doubt of the truth of this, and other relations of this kind? We know of whom it is ſaid, That *his coming is* (x) *after* (x) 2 Theſ. 2. 9.

the

the working of Satan, with all power, and ſigns, and lying wonders. If I might adviſe, the Pope ſhould put forth a Bull for the prohibiting, yea for the burning all their Legends and Hiſtories of feigned Miracles: they don't gain, but loſe greatly in their reputation by means thereof. Yea, what if I ſhould ſay the Chriſtian Religion ſuffers greatly in the World upon this very account? How have Jews and Infidels been hardned in their unbelief of the Goſpel, and of the Miracles that Chriſt and his Apoſtles wrought for the Confirmation of it? and all by reaſon of thoſe Fables, and lying Miracles that are obtruded upon the World by thoſe of the Church of *Rome*. Repent, O *Rome*; repent in time of the wound that thou haſt given to Chriſtianity upon the ſcore of theſe Fables and Forgeries.

(y) The Apoſtaſie of the Latter Times.

'Tis worth our notice, and may ſerve as a farther Anſwer to this Plea, what Mr. *Mede* offers (y) in his Treatiſe before-cited, *That the Gentiles Dæmon-worſhip did enter into the World after the ſame manner, it was firſt inſinuated, and afterwards eſtabliſhed by Signs and Wonders of the very ſelf ſame-kind; ſo that the Idolatry of Saint-worſhip is in this reſpect alſo a true counterfeit of their Idolatry of Dæmons.* He brings in *Chryſoſtom* affirming that the *Dæmons* of the Gentiles wrought Miracles for the Confirmation of Paganiſm, and the Pagan Idolatry. *They often-times by their skill cured Diſeaſes, and reſtored to health thoſe that were ſick. What,* (ſays he) *ſhould we partake therefore with them in their impiety? God forbid.* He cites *Euſebius* alſo to this purpoſe: "When (ſays he) thoſe wicked Spirits (meaning thoſe that were worſhipped under the "names of *Dæmons*) ſaw mankind brought off "to a deifying of the Dead, they inſinuated "themſelves, and helpt forward their errour, "by cauſing motions in thoſe Statues, which "were conſecrated to the Honour of the Deceaſed, as alſo by Oracles and curing of "Diſeaſes: by means of which the ſuperſtitious and credulous people "took them to be ſome Heavenly Powers, and gods indeed; ſometimes to be the Souls of their deified Worthies. And thus (ſaith he) "the Earth-Neighbouring *Dæmons*, which are the Princes of the Air, "thoſe Spiritualities of wickedneſs, and Ring-leaders of all evil, were "on all hands accounted for great gods. And farther he adds, That "the Memory of deceaſed Worthies was celebrated with great ſervice, "the feature of whoſe Bodies the dedicated Images in every City ſeem'd "to repreſent, but their Souls the wicked *Dæmons* counterfeited by "working many wonders. Let me ſhut up this anſwer with the ſaying of a laborious and learned perſon, his words are theſe: (a) *If it be ob-*

Quærite ſi vera eſt Divinitas Chriſti; ſi eſt ea, qua cognita, ad bonum quis reformetur ſequitur ut falſa renuncietur, comperta imprimis illa omni ratione; quæ delitescens ſub nominibus & imaginibus mortuorum, quibuſdam ſignis & miraculis, & oraculis, fidem divinitatis operatur. Tertul. Apol. ad Gent. cap. 21. in fine.

(a) Willet. in his Synop. Papiſmi, p. 437. *Ex ſolis miraculis, ſine teſtimoniis verbi Dei, non poſſe ullum dogma probari nec hoc titulo debere recipi ipſa ſcrip. diſerte teſtatur,* Deut. 15 Chemnic. Exām. *Cecilius* ſaith of the *Dæmons* of the Heathens, *Dant cautelam periculi, morbis Medelam, opem miſeris, ſolatium calamitatibus, laboribus levamentum.* Minut. p. 7.

jected,

jected, *That many have prayed to the Saints, and particularly to the Virgin* Mary, *and have obtained their requests, and therefore such prayers are available. We answer, That is no good Argument which is taken from the event: for so* Livy *writeth, that* Romulus *prayed to* Jupiter, *that he would stay the flight of the* Romans, *that he might keep off the* Sabines, *and it was effected.* Pliny *also reporteth, that one* Helpis *seeing a rampant Lion come against him, prayed to* Bacchus, *and was delivered. Like as the praying to Heathen gods is not justified by the subsequent effects, no more is the invocating of Saints,* &c.

Come we now to a conclusion. I desire in the close of all that these three particulars may be considered.

1. That this Discourse doth not destroy that Communion of Saints which is the common belief of all Christians. It is levell'd against the Invocation, not against the Communion of Saints. *Jerusalem* is sometimes put for the Church Militant on Earth, and sometimes for the Church Triumphant in Heaven, to shew that both make but one City of God. The Church below, and the Church above, are two parts of one and the same Catholick Church, whence it is that those who are sanctified, and called on Earth, are said to be come to the spirits of just men made perfect in Heaven. So the Apostle tells the *Hebrews*, that they are brought by the Gospel into a blessed Society, *with God the Judge of all, with Jesus Christ the Mediator of the new Covenant, with an innumerable company of Angels, and with the spirits of just men made perfect.* Both those that are already made perfect, and those that still abide in a state of imperfection, are fellow-Citizens, (as he elsewhere phraseth it) and have mutual fellowship or communion one with another. They have mutual relation to one Father, and Children of the same Father have mutual fellowship amongst themselves: they have mutual union with one Head, and Members of the same body have mutual communion one with another: they have their animation by one and the same Spirit, as all the Members are animated by one and the same Soul: that Spirit which dwells in the Saints on Earth, doth bear them company into Heaven.

If it be demanded wherein this Communion consisteth which is between the Saints above, and the Saints below? I answer, It consists mainly in mutual affections and communications one to another. The Saints in Heaven rejoice at God's preservation of his Church on Earth; that so many of their brethren and fellow-servants are daily fitted for Heaven, and translated thither, whereby their blessed Society is increased. The Saints above may also pray and intercede for those below: for though the Papists confound these two, (as they do other things) to wit, the Intercession and the Invocation of Saints, yet there is a wide difference betwixt them: *(b)* And there be who allow them to pray for us, who yet will not admit of our praying unto them. (See *Rev.* 6. 10.) But then they say that this Intercession of theirs is for the

(b) *They are very different questions, whether the Saints pray for us, and whether we must pray to them? It is one thing to know what the Saints do in Heaven, and another thing to know what we must do on Earth.* P. du Moulin.

Church in general, and not for this or that Member in particular, whose case or person it's most likely is not known to them. On the other side, the Saints on Earth they pray for the Resurrection of the Bodies of the Saints in Heaven, that in Body as well as in Spirit they may be perfected and glorified. Yea, this is one sense of that Petition in the Lords Prayer, *Thy Kingdom come.* They likewise praise God for the rest they enjoy in Heaven, that they are delivered from this valley of tears and trouble. They also groan, and that earnestly, to be glorified with them, and to be translated into their condition and company. Above all, they set them before them as their examples, walking in their godly steps; *being followers of them as they have been followers of that which is good.* Though they don't invocate them, yet they study to imitate them, which is the highest honour they can put upon them. This is that which the Apostle requires in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, when he bids us, *to be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.*

2. This Discourse serves to excite Christians to be much in calling on him in whom they believe. To be frequent in praying to God in the Name of Jesus Christ. *Take* (says James) *the Prophets for an example of patience, and of suffering affliction.* Take, I say, the Papists for an example of prayer, (such as it is) and unwearied devotion. It was the advice of a good man to his friend, that he would spend as much time every day in prayer and meditating, as he did in eating and drinking. It were well if we spent as many hours every day in the service and worship of God, as some of them do in serving and worshipping the Saints. We may receive instruction from Oxen and Asses, and other bruit Creatures, and so we may from the blind Papists. *Go to the Ant, thou Sluggard*; and go to the Papist, thou slothful Christian: He hath his Canonical and stated hours for his devotion, he's diligent in turning over his Beads, in pattering over his *Pater Nosters* and *Ave Maries*, and will admit of no avocation. How then art thou to be reproved, who neglectest prayer to God from day to day? How many prayerless families and persons are there in this Nation? Christ says, *The Ninevites shall rise up in the Judgment against the Jews*, and the Papists will rise up in the Judgment against many Protestants, *and condemn them.* The charge of *Eliphaz* against *Job* will lie more rightly against many a one in the midst of us; you'll find it in *Job* 15. 4. he says there, *Thou castest off fear, and restrainest prayer before God.* (c) Some read the words thus, Thou multipliest prayer. The word notes (as one observes) the cutting or dividing a thing into small pieces or portions, which is indeed to multiply it. And 'tis as if he should have said, Thou dost mince thy prayers, and cut them out into many small shreads, as if thou didst hope to be heard for thy much speaking. Such were the Devotions of the Pharisees of old, and such are the Devotions of the Papists their Successors, to this day. Their *Collects* and *Litanies* are full

(c) *Arguitur Job quod multiloquio vel battologia usus est.* Bold V. Caryl in locum.

full of *vain Repetitions*, the ſame things over and over again. But take the words as they are in our Tranſlation, *Thou reſtraineſt prayer before God*; and then they note either a total forbearing, or a partial diminiſhing of the duty: ſome don't pray at all, others pray but ſeldom; both come under this reproof of reſtraining prayer. Remember who commands you, to *pray always*, and to *pray without ceaſing*. Reſolve, Reader, whoever thou art, upon more frequency and fervency in this duty. Let an hour, or more, every day be ſet apart for ſecret prayer; and be ſure, as *Elias* did, *(d) to pray in prayer*. The Papiſts and others ſay prayers, but do thou pray in prayer to God. 'Tis recorded of *(e) Luther* that he prayed every day three hours, *(eaſque ad ſtudia aptiſſimas)* and that when he was moſt fit for ſuch a ſervice: *Go thou and do likewiſe.*

(d) Προσευχῇ προσηύξατο. James 5. 17.

(e) V. Vit. Theod. in vita ejus. *Judge* Cooke *adviſed to four hours in a day for this exerciſe.*

Sex horas ſomno, totidem dei legibus æquis, quatuor orabis, Epuliſque duas; Quod ſupereſt ſacris ultro largire camœnis. King *Alfred* divided every day into three parts, he allowed eight hours to his devotion, eight to his employment, and eight to his ſleep and refection.

3. This Diſcourſe may have this farther fruit, to beget a diſlike, yea a deteſtation of Popery. One would wonder that a man in his right ſenſes ſhould ever become a Papiſt. Their opinions many of them are not only unſcriptural, but irrational, a man muſt offer violence to his reaſon if he complies with them. I might give many inſtances, conſider theſe two; the one is praying for the Dead, the other is praying to the Dead. We cannot help the Dead by praying for them, nor can they hear us when we pray unto them. Yea, the Popiſh Religion is not only ridiculous, but Idolatrous. There is a fivefold Idolatry which we charge upon the Church of *Rome*. 1. The worſhipping of the *Croſs*. 2. The worſhipping of *Images*. 3. The worſhipping of *Relicks*. 4. The worſhipping of the *Elements* in the *Euchariſt*. 5. The worſhipping of *Saints and Angels*. Well may ſhe be called the *Whore of Babylon*, yea that *great Whore, and the Mother of Fornications, and Abominations of the Earth*. The Church of the Jews did not forſake the true God altogether, only ſhe would worſhip him in *Calves and Images*, and how often for this reaſon is ſhe called a *Whore*, and an *abominable Harlot?* The Church of *Rome* is a worſer Strumpet than ever ſhe was; *a deep Ditch* ſhe is, may none amongſt us be ſo *far abhorred of the Lord as to fall into it*. Dearly beloved Country-men, *Flee from Idolatry: this the abominable thing that God hateth.* Popiſh Idolatry is as bad or worſe than Paganiſh. I ſhall conclude this Sermon as the Apoſtle *John* doth his firſt Epiſtle, *Little Children, keep your ſelves from Idols.* Amen.

SERMON XVI.

No Works of Supererogation.

Luke 17. 10. *So likewiſe ye, when ye ſhall have done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay, We are unprofitable ſervants, we have done that which was our duty to do.*

THE Truth that at this time lies before me, both to prove and improve, is this, **That there are not any Works of Supererogation.** On that account I have pitcht on the words read, which are an *Apodoſis*, or *Epiphonema*, the Inference or *Concluſion* which our Lord Jeſus draws from his preceding Parable.

Coherence.

The Parable begins Verſe 7. *Which of you, having a ſervant plowing, or feeding cattel, will ſay unto him by and by when he is come from the field, Go, and ſit down to meat?* Verſ. 8. *And will not rather ſay unto him, Make ready wherewith I may ſup, and gird thy ſelf, and ſerve me till I have eaten and drunken.* Verſ. 9. *Doth he thank that ſervant becauſe he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not.* Verſ. 10. *So likewiſe ye, when ye ſhall,* &c.

Paraphraſe.

A. δῦλ☉, q. δοῦλος, a δέω ligo, mancipium, *a bond-ſlave.* Servus a ſervando, ſervi primum e captivis facti ſunt ab iis, a quibus jure belli eos occidi liceret. Voſſius. δοῦλ☉ ejus correlatum, δεσπότης; oppoſitum, ἐλεύθερ☉, ἐκ ἐν δοῦλ☉ ἐλεύθερ☉, Gal. 3. 28.

Doth he thank *that ſervant?* τῷ δούλῳ ἐκείνῳ; or if you will, that *captive-ſlave*, (who is wholly at his foot and diſpoſe) as if forſooth by his obedience he had done his Maſter a free kindneſs and favour, to which he was not obliged? Hath that *Vaſſal* in ſtrictneſs of juſtice *obliged* his Maſter? and is his Maſter *bound* to look upon himſelf as obliged to return his Vaſſal thanks, and to *reward* him for doing the things that were commanded him? *I trow not*, οἶμαι δοκῶ, I think, ſuppoſe, judge not. Neither the perſon nor the ſervice do in truth *deſerve or merit* any thing, no not ſo much as *thanks*, nor can in juſtice claim it. The *Ranſomed Vaſſal* his All, his Life, Spirits, Strength, Service; All that he is, hath, can do, ſuffer, are *his Maſters*, not his own, and therefore wholly and ſolely at his abſolute diſpoſe and command. *Doth he then thank that ſervant? I trow not.* True indeed, though the great God owes us no thanks, yet *in infinite grace* he is pleaſed ſo far to *ſtoop* beneath himſelf, as *to give us thanks.*

thanks for our obedience, and to beſpeak us in ſuch a *condeſcending* language, as if indeed he were beholden to us. 1 *Pet.* 2. 19. Τοῦτο χάρις, *This is thank-worthy, if a man for conſcience toward God endure grief, ſuffering wrongfully:* i. e. God accounts himſelf hereby *gratified* as it were, and even *beholden* to ſuch ſufferers; this, being the *loweſt* ſubjection, and that being the *higheſt* honour men can yield unto their Maker. God will thank ſuch. Nay more, look into that amazing Scripture, *Luke* 12. 36, 37. and read it, if you can without an extaſie: *If a man ſerves, and his Lord comes and finds him watching too, and intent upon his work, what will his Lord do? he will gird himſelf, and ſerve him. O ſtupenda condeſcenſio! O ſtupenda dignatio!* ſays one on the place. But know, though theſe two Parables ſeem parallel, their *ſcope* vaſtly differs. What a diligent Servant may *humbly expect* from his bountiful Lord is *one thing, viz.* That his labour ſhall not be in * vain, or unprofitable, but plentifully rewarded. That's the ſcope of *Luke* 12. And what the moſt diligent Slave can *juſtly challenge* from his abſolute Lord and Patron *is another*, which is the grand ſcope of the Text. Doth he deſerve, or may he juſtly challenge any the leaſt reward, yea but ſo much as *bare thanks?* I trow not. *So likewiſe ye, &c.*

* 1 Cor. 15. 58.

When ye ſhall have done all thoſe things which are commanded you, (a) Ὅταν ποιήσητε. The learned *Glaſſius* obſerves, that in theſe words our Saviour doth not inſinuate that any man arrives at that *ſinleſs* perfection in this life, as to do all thoſe things which God commands: for how much ſoever we have done, it will appear upon a juſt balance of account, that we have done *leſs* than we ought, and are much *ſhort* of our duty. But Chriſt ſpeaks here *conditionally*, and *ſuppoſes* only what he doth not *aſſert* or grant, q. d. *if it were poſſible* for them to do all things that were *(b)* commanded by God in his holy Word, *to do all that good that God requires*, Micah 6. 8. to walk exactly *according to that good, accceptable and perfect will of God*, Rom. 12. 2. Heb. 13. 21. All thoſe good things, I ſay, which God preſcribes in his Word, and *not ſuch as fond men* deviſe, either out of *blind Zeal*, or upon pretence of good intention, *without the warrant* of the Word, Matth. 15. 9. Iſai. 29. 13. 1 Pet. 1. 18. Rom. 10. 2. Joh. 16. 2. 1 Sam. 15. 21, to 24.

(a) Ὅταν, *particula temporis indeterminati pro ſi. Glaſſ. gram. Sacr. l. 3. Tract. 7. Can. 5.*

(b) Πάντα τὰ διαταχθέντα ὑμῖν, *omnia, quæ præcepta, edicta, injuncta, ſancita ſunt vobis, a ταῦτα ordine. actem inſtrao..*

Suppoſing then that you have *done* all theſe things, (c) πάντα, and that with utmoſt *Art and Induſtry*, as a man would do a *curious piece of Work*, which he intends to expoſe as his *Maſterpiece* to the moſt curious view of all Obſervers,----- Well, and what then? *Then ſay ye, We are unprofitable ſervants.* When God lookt back on the Works of his hands, and ſaw every thing that he had made, he did, and might moſt juſtly ſay, *Behold, it is very good*, Gen. 1. 31. But as for you, when ye have done your utmoſt, ſay ye, *We are unprofitable ſervants.*--- Yes, ſay the Papiſts, *ſay ſo indeed*, but this is only out of *humility* and *modeſty*, for ye are not really unprofitable. To whom we give this ſhort reply.

(c) Ποιῶ, *edo. præſto, propie ſignif. rem. aliquam certis qualitatibus orno. a* πῶς *qualis.-- facio a* φάω *luceo, qui rem facit, dat tam luci, atque ut conſpiciatur. facit Voſſius*, Joh. 8. 31. & 3. 21.

reply. Christ doth not hear teach his Disciples the art of *modest* lying, and that to God himself, to say one thing, and to think another. No, without question we are to say so, and that from the *heart*, and in saying so, we speak the truth, and nothing but the truth. *We are indeed unprofitable servants*, such as cannot *merit* the least good at the hand of God by our best obedience.

(d) ἀχρεῖοι, *inutiles, ab a priv. & χρεία usus, utiles, commodum.*

(d) *Unprofitable*, ἀχρεῖοι. 'Tis well observed by some *Criticks*, that this word is of the same import with that *Rom.* 3. 12. they are become *unprofitable*, ἠχρεώθησαν, so the Sept. render *Psal.* 14. 3. & 53. 3. The word in the Original (e) נאלחך, They are become *abominable*, *putidi facti sunt*; so far from being profitable, that they rather *stink* in God's Nostrils. Nay farther, 'tis the same word that is given to that wicked and slothful servant that was cast out into outer darkness. *Cast out that* (f) *unprofitable servant*, Mat. 25. 30. To shew us, saith one, what our merit is, if God should be severe, *Psal.* 143. 2.

(e) אלח, *putidus fœtidus fuit*, Job 15. 16.

(f) Τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον ἐκβάλλετε.

In the *last* place, our Saviour subjoins the reason why he would have us heartily to acknowledge our selves unprofitable servants, and 'tis this, *Because if we had*, or could have *done all those things*, &c. we had then *done but that which we ought to do*; that, and that only, that, and no more than was our (g) duty to do, and on that account the Lord by a just right might exact and challenge it at our hands. We owe all obedience possible to *God as our Creator*, Psal. 100. 2, 3. & 33. 8, 9. The highest obedience is our *debt*, and it is no matter of merit to pay a man's debts. How good soever any man is, he is no *better* than he should be; and what good soever any man hath *done*, he hath done no more than was his *duty* to do both to God and man. On this account, saith our Saviour, if you could and should do all those things, &c.

(g) Ὀφειλομεν, *ab ὀφείλω, debeo, are alieno obstrictus sum oportet me.*

From the words thus opened, I infer these *two* Conclusions.

1. *They, who in their Obedience attain to the greatest heighth which is possible in this life, fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.*

2. *Were it possible for the best of men perfectly to keep the Law of God, yet even these supposed perfect ones cannot in the least oblige God, or merit any thing from the hand of his justice.*

These two Propositions *solidly* fixt, and *fitly* discharged, may through a *smile* from Heaven prove effectual for the battering down of one of the topmost *Pinacles* of the *Romish Babel*, *viz.* their proud Doctrine of *Supererogation.*

1 *Conclusion.* First of the first. *They, who in their Obedience attain to the greatest heighth which is possible in this life, fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.*

Quest. 1. But what is every man in this life in duty *bound* to do?

Answ.

Anſw. Every man in this life is *bound to full conformity, in the whole man, to the righteous Law of God, and to entire, exact and perpetual obedience thereunto.* The Law of the Lord is *perfect*, Pſal. 19. 7. and requires the higheſt *perfection* both of *parts* and *degrees*; and that

1. *In the frame and diſpoſition of the whole man, ſoul and body.* It reaches all the faculties, motions and operations of the *inward*, as well as the *words*, *works* and *geſtures* of the outward. Man, as God's Creature, is bound to love *the Lord his God with all his heart, ſoul, mind, might, and ſtrength*, Deut. 16. 5. Mat. 27. 37, to 41. Luke 10. 26, 27. The *firſt bublings* of raſh anger, are no leſs forbidden by this *Royal* Law, than *cruel Murther*, Mat. 5. 21, 22. A *Luſt peeping out* of the eye, is no leſs a violation of this *Spiritual* Law, than an *unclean* act, Verſ. 27, 28.

2. *In the performance of all thoſe duties of holineſs and righteouſneſs which he oweth to God and man.* Iſrael muſt *hear all God's Commandments*, Statutes and Judgments, that they might learn, and keep, and do them, *Deut.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 31, 33. He hath ſhewed thee, O man, what is good, truly and acceptably good; and *what doth the Lord thy God require of thee?* ſurely ſomething, that in the *balance of the Sanctuary down weighs* thouſands of Rams, and ten thouſands of Rivers of Oyl, nay, is *more acceptable* than the Idolatrous ſacrificing of a *firſt-born* Son, namely, *To do juſtly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God*, Mic. 6. 6, 7, 8. Holy *Paul* writes after this *Copy*, but could not reach it; 'twas his *exerciſe and endeavour*, though not his *attainment*, to get and keep *a good Conſcience void of offence*, both towards God, and towards man, *Acts* 24. 16.

3. *In this univerſal performance of all obedience, the Law requires the utmoſt perfection in every duty, and forbids the leaſt degree of every ſin.* Who ſo ſhall keep the whole Law, and *yet offend in one point*, i. e. willingly, conſtantly, and with allowance from Conſcience, though but in the *leaſt tittle*, *he is guilty of all*, i. e. is liable to the ſame puniſhment, ſtands upon no better terms of hope and acceptance with God, than if he had done nothing. James 2. 10.

Obj. But what's all this to Believers? *They are not under the Law, but under Grace*, Rom. 6. 14.

Anſw. 1. True Believers are not under the Law *as a Covenant of Works*, ſo as to be thereby either *juſtified*, Gal. 2. 16. Act. 13. 39. or *condemned*, Rom. 8. 1. Gal. 3. 13.

2. But yet they are under the *Conduct* of the Law, *viz.* as it is a *Rule of Life*, *informing* them of the Will of God, and their Duty, and doth at once *direct and bind them* to walk accordingly. See what high apprehenſions *Paul* had of this Law, *The Law is holy, and the Commandment is holy, juſt and good*, Rom. 7. 12. His *dear affection* to it, *I delight in the Law of God after the inner man*, Verſ. 22. His *faithful obſervance* of it, *With the mind I my ſelf ſerve the Law of God*, Verſ. 25.

Copies

Copies out a great part of it, and preſents it as *a Rule to the Romans* to walk by, *Rom.* 13. 7, 8, 9. and to other Churches, 1 *Cor.* 7. 19. *Gal.* 5. 14. *Epheſ.* 6. 2, 3. *James* calls it *A Royal Law*, the Law of God, the King of Kings, and Jeſus Chriſt the King of Saints. It hath a *Kingly* Author, requires *Noble* Work, gives *Royal* Wages, a Law of Liberty, which if ye ſhall fulfil, if ye have reſpect to the whole duty and compaſs thereof, *ye ſhall do well*, and but well, *Jam.* 1. 25. & 2. 8. Thus the *Beloved* Diſciple backs the Authority of the Law, 1 *John* 2. 3, 4, 7, 8.

Object. But hath not the Lord Jeſus in the Goſpel *diſſolved this Obligation?*

Anſw. Yea, ſo *far* is Chriſt in the Goſpel *from diſſolving*, that he much *ratifies* and *ſtrengthens* this Obligation, *Matth.* 5. 17, 18, 19. *I came not to deſtroy, but to fulfil*; in this Chapter clearly *expounds it*, elſewhere moſt ſtrictly *enjoins* it, *Matth.* 22. 37, to 44. *Luke* 10. 26, 27. *Mark* 12. 33. *Paul* goes deep in the caſe, and rejects the thought of it with the deepeſt averſation, *Rom.* 3. 31. Do we then *make void the Law through faith? God forbid: yea, we eſtabliſh the Law.*

Thus you have heard what every man in this life is in duty bound to do: namely, *perfectly*, intirely, *exactly*, perpetually to keep the Commandments of God: That's his duty. In the next place, let us ſpeak to his *Ability*, or rather *utter impotency* to perform this duty.

2. *They who in their Obedience attain to the greateſt heighth which is poſſible in this life, fall ſhort of much which in duty they are bound to do.*

Since the fall of the *firſt Adam*, our common Head and Repreſentative, *no meer man* deſcending from him by *ordinary* Generation, in *this* life ever was, is, or *ſhall* be *able*, either by himſelf, or by any ſtrength of Grace received, *perfectly to keep the Commandments of God*, but doth *daily* break them in *thought*, word and deed.

1. *Since* Adam's *fall.*---- True indeed, the *firſt Adam* in his eſtate of *innocency* had a power, *perſonally* and *perfectly*, to keep the whole Law of God; but *not ſince*, neither he, nor any that naturally ſpring from his loins. 'Twas the dream of the old *Pelagians*, that man was ſo little *bruiſed and impaired by* Adam's *fall*, that even ſtill by the meer power of Nature he could perfectly keep the whole Law. If ſo, what means the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 5. 12, 17, 18, 19. 1 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. By *Adam's* ſin were all made unrighteous, ſubject to death, *judgment*, condemnation; and therefore ſuch unrighteous, *judged*, condemned Creatures as we are all by Nature, can never *perfectly* fulfil a *righteous* Law.

2. *No meer man: none that is a man and no more.*---- No man deſcending from *Adam* by *ordinary* Generation. True, the only *Mediator* between God and man, the *Man Chriſt Jeſus*, was able perfectly to keep the Commandments of God, and did ſo. Conceived he was *without ſin*, *Luke* 1. 35. *Heb.* 4. 15. Anointed with the Holy Ghoſt *above meaſure*,

ſure, Joh. 3. 34. *Holy, harmleſs, undefiled, ſeparate from ſinners*, Heb. 7. 26. Came on purpoſe to *fulfil* the Law, *Mat.* 5. 17. and did *perfectly* fulfil it, *Pſal.* 40. 7, 8. *Heb.* 10. 5, to 11. *Mat.* 3. 17. *John* 17. 4.

But then he was *not a* * *meer man*, He was *God* as well as *man*, *Rom.* 9. 5. *Col.* 2. 9. God *incarnate*, the Eternal *Word* made Fleſh, *John* 1. 14. *manifeſted in the Fleſh*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. But *no meer man.*

* Ἀναμφιβόλως Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου κεῖται παρὰ τὴν γνώμην ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος. Clem. conſtit. l. 2. c. 18.

3. *Not in this life.* We grant, that when the Soul comes to be *inroll'd*, and admitted a *Free Denizen* of the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*, ſhe ſhall ſit down *among the Spirits of juſt men made perfect*, Heb. 12. 23. but not till then. When the Saints come *to the meaſure of the ſtature of the fulneſs of Chriſt*, Epheſ. 4. 13. When they come *to ſee God as he is*, and ſhall behold his face in Light and Glory, then, and not till then they ſhall be like him, 1 *John* 3. 2. Then indeed they ſhall ſee God *face to face*, *but here only through a glaſs darkly*, 1 Cor. 13. 12. then preſented *a glorious Church*, not having *ſpot or wrinkle*, Epheſ. 5. 27. But whilſt here, like the *Moon* at Full, not without our ſpots.

4. *Not able perfectly to keep the Commandments of God.*

There is indeed a *twofold perfection* aſcribed to Saints in this life.

1. *A perfection of Juſtification.* Saints are *compleat in Chriſt* their Head and Surety, *Col.* 2. 10. They are *perfectly juſtified, never more liable to Condemnation*, Rom. 8. 1, 33, 34. Heb. 10. 14. Joh. 5. 24.

2. *A perfection of Holineſs or Sanctification*; and this ſo called,

1. *In regard of its eſſential or integral parts.* Thus when we ſee an *Infant*, that hath all the *parts* of a man, ſoul, body, all its members: we ſay, this is a *perfect Child.* Saints, even in this life, have this *begun perfection* of holineſs. They are begun to be ſanctified *in every part*, in ſoul, *body*, ſpirit, *throughout*, though every part be not *throughout* ſanctified, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 23.

2. *In regard of deſires, intendments, aims at, and endeavours after gradual perfection.* They deſire, *ſtudy*, labour to be perfect, *as their Heavenly Father is perfect*, Mat. 5. 48. They *forget that which is behind, and preſs forward towards the mark*, Phil. 3. 12, 13. *Perfection*, which will be their *reward* in Heaven, is their *aim* on Earth; and, as God *accepts* the will for the deed, 2 *Cor.* 8. 12. ſo he *expreſſeth* the deed by the will, and candidly interprets him to be a *perfect man*, who would be perfect, and deſires to have all his imperfections cured.

3. *In reſpect of others, comparatively perfect.* Thus, when one man is *ſickly* and weak, and *another* man is *very ſtrong*, we ſay the ſtrong man hath *perfect health* compared with him that is *ſickly* and weak; and yet the ſtrong man hath *not ſuch perfect health*, but he hath alſo the *principle of ſickneſs* in his body, and ſometime may be ill, and indiſpoſed. Thus *Noah* was *perfect in his Generation*, Gen. 6. 9. *Lot* among the *Sodomites*, *Job* in the Land of *Uz*, *Job* 1. 1. Thus *Saints* in Scripture are ſaid to *be perfect*, when compared with thoſe that were *openly wicked*, or *but openly* holy; ſaid to be *men without ſpot*, compared with thoſe that were

either *all over-spotted* with filthiness, or only *painted* with Godliness. Thus those that were *stronger* in Knowledge and Grace, laid in the *Scale* with those that were weaker; men with babes, 1 *Cor.* 2. 6. *Phil.* 3. 15. *Heb.* 5. 14. are said to be perfect.

4. *In respect of Divine acceptation*, an Evangelical Perfection, a Perfection of *sincerity* and uprightness; such, as love our *Lord Jesus in sincerity*, Ephes. 6. 24. Such, as are not *gilded*, but *golden Christians*; not *painted Sepulchres*, not *whited Walls*; not men *of an heart and an heart*. Thus God to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 1. Walk before me, and *be thou perfect*, or upright. *Aarons* indeed in this, that they carry *Urim and Thummim*, Light, and *Perfection*, or *Uprightness*, engraven on their breasts, *Exod.* 28. 30. on whose *Tombs* you may, with God's approbation and *Testimonial*, write an *Asa's Epitaph*, 2 *Chron.* 15. 17. *Nevertheless*, notwithstanding *Asa* his several *slips*, yet his heart was *perfect with his God* all his days.

5. *In respect of degrees, to which nothing is wanting, nothing can be added to make it more compleat.* When the *Sun* is not only risen, but got to its full *Meridian* and *Zenith*. Thus, when we see *a Child* that was born perfect as to parts, *grown up to mans estate*, so that he shall grow no taller, wax no stronger: this we call *Perfection of degrees*. And thus no Saint in this life, is or can be *perfect*, as to include *all the degrees* of holiness, and to exclude all, *even the least taint* of sin. * And, if there be but the least gradual defect, the Law is not perfectly fulfilled. Now that no man is in this life so perfect, &c. appears,

* *Peccatum est, cum non est charitas, quæ esse debet, vel minor est, quam esse debet.* Aug. de perfectione Justitiæ.

1. In this, *That there is not one instance to be given of any one, even the most holy man that ever breathed on God's Earth, that was so holy and perfect as to be freed from having sin in him.* O the *blots* that we find in the *best* of their *Escutcheons!* *Noah* at once betrays his *internal* and *external* nakedness. *Abraham*, the Father of the faithful, *equivocates* more than once. *Moses*, that conversed with God *mouth to mouth*, the great *Secretary* of Heaven, is guilty of unbelief, and speaks *unadvisedly* with his lips. What shall I speak of *David*, *Hezekiah*, *Josiah*, those Stars of the *highest* Magnitude? As for *Paul*, even after he had been wrapt up into the third Heavens, hear his groans, his heart-piercing groans, *Rom.* 7. 24. *O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?* and free confession of his imperfection, *Phil.* 3. 12, 13, 14. *Not that I have already attained, or were already perfect*, &c. As for *Peter* concerning his perfection, read, *but with fear and trembling*, *Matth.* 26. 69. to the end; and when thou hast mingled *tears* with him, draw a finger on his *scar*, and go, and ask *His holy Successor*, that most humble *Servant of Servants* the Pope, whether he, or any of the *Scarlet Robe* under him, dare compare with those truly golden ones for holiness, notwithstanding all their dross? and if not, what becomes of their proud *dream* of gradual Perfection?

Gal. 2. 11, 12.

2. *How many expres's Scriptures are there, that prove, that no man is perfectly*

perfectly holy in this life? *Solomon* gives us *three*, 1 King. 8. 46. *There is no man that ſinneth not.* Eccleſ. 7. 20. *There is not a juſt man upon earth that doth good, and ſinneth not:* q. d. If you would look for a juſt one that doth good, and ſinneth not, you muſt look for ſuch an one in *Heaven*, and not upon *Earth*. The learned and judicious Dr. *Manton* hath an excellent Note on this Text, *viz.* The Wiſe-man doth not ſay ſimply, *that ſinneth not*, but, *that doth good and ſinneth not*; that is, that ſinneth not even whilſt he is doing good. Our very *Wine* is mixed with *Water*; our *beſt Silver* with *Droſs*. Our ſofteſt Lawn hath its Liſt, our *ſweeteſt* Honey its *Wax and ſting*. Farther yet, he throws down his *Gantlet*, and proclaims a *Challenge* to all the World, to enter the Liſts with him, *Prov.* 20. 9. *Who can ſay, I have made my heart clean?* Who can? why many can and do, Phariſees, Papiſts, Quakers. True, many may ſay ſo boldly, *proudly*, falſly, but who can ſay ſo *truly? I am pure from my ſin. If we ſay that we have no ſin, we deceive our ſelves, and the truth is not in us*, 1 John 1. 8, 10. If we ſay that we have not ſinned, *we make him a lyar, and his Word is not in us.* The Doctrine of the *Cathariſts* is a lying Doctrine. Even from this Scripture it plainly appears, that that man is *not perfect*, that ſaith he is perfect, for as much as it ſaith, that he, that ſaith ſo, *is a lyar*, and one that is ſo far from *growth* and perfection, that the *Truth* it ſelf, the Root of the matter, is not in him. None in this life are abſolutely freed and exempted from ſinning, *Jam.* 3. 2. *In many things we offend all.* All of us offend in many things, in ſome things at beſt. The bleſſed *Virgin* her ſelf had her ſlips, *Luke* 2. 49. *John* 2. 3, 4. for which ſhe is taxed by Chriſt himſelf. *We offend.* We includes himſelf, though an Apoſtle of ſuch eminent holineſs, that he was called *the Juſt*. *Job* 9. 2, 3, 20. *How ſhould man be juſt with God?* or as *Broughton* reads the words, *How can man be juſt before the Omnipotent?* Juſt, *i. e.* by an inherent righteouſneſs before God. *If he will contend with him, he cannot anſwer him one of a thouſand.* Man is not able to maintain his cauſe, and to hold his plea with an holy God. Hence it is, that that man after God's own heart, wholly *waves* God's *Tribunal* of Juſtice. *O enter not into Judgment with thy Servant*, Lord; he doth not ſay, with an Enemy, a *Rebel*, a Traytor, an *Impenitent Sinner*; but *with thy Servant*, one that is *devoted* to thy fear, one that is *conſecrated* to thy ſervice, one that is really and indeed *quantus, quantus eſt, totus tuus*, Pſal. 143. 2. q. d. Lord, if the holieſt, pureſt, beſt of men ſhould come and ſtand before thee in Judgment, or *plead* with thee, they muſt needs be *caſt* in their cauſe; *If thou, Lord, ſhouldſt mark iniquity, alas, who ſhall ſtand?* Pſal. 130. 3.

Dr. *Manton* on *James*, p. 351.

Rom. 3 9, to 21, & 23.

Euſeb Eccl. Hiſt. l. 2. c. 1.

Job 15. 14, 15.

3. *It is utterly impoſſible in this life perfectly to keep the Commandments of God*, becauſe the beſt of Saints in this life are but *imperfectly* ſanctified. The *principle* of Grace within them, which is the *Fountain*, is but *imperfect*, and therefore the *ſtreams* of obedience can never riſe

higher than the Fountain. The *Root* is tainted, and the Sap and Branch, therefore the *Fruit* cannot be perfectly ſound. While the Tree is *partly* evil, the Fruit cannot be *wholly* good. As to the great Grace of *Faith*, what great reaſon hath Chriſt to ſay to the beſt of Saints, as more than once to his Diſciples, *O ye of little Faith? Matth.* 6. 30. & 8. 26. & 16. 8. Where is the man of ſo much braſs and impudence, that dares avouch he *loves God* with that degree of intenſeneſs that he ought to do? that he loves God here with as raiſed, *tranſcendent*, ſuperlative flame of heart, as ever he ſhall do, or can hope to do in Heaven? Love always attends on knowledge: I cannot poſſibly *love* that, which I do not *know*. 'Tis the *eye* that muſt *affect* the heart. *Ignoti nulla cupido.* Nor can the degree of my *love* exceed the degree of my *knowledge*. It may indeed ſink *beneath it*, but never ſwells *above it*. Now our *knowledge* of God in this life is imperfect; *We know but in part*, we ſee through a Glaſs, and that darkly, 1 *Cor.* 13. 9, 12. and therefore cannot love with all the heart, ſoul, mind, ſtrength. More than this, there are *remnants* of ſin abiding in every part of Saints, and perpetual luſtings of the fleſh againſt the ſpirit, *ſo that they cannot do the things that they would*, Gal. 5. 17. A Law in their members warring againſt the Law of their minds, and leads them *captive to the Law of ſin*, Rom. 7. 18, 23. They have a *Clog* at their heels, *ſin that eaſily beſets them*, Heb. 12. 1. *Luſts within them, that war againſt their ſouls*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 11. There is indeed in every man, even in the holieſt living, *a curſed root of* **bitterneſs*, which God doth indeed more and more *mortifie*, but not *nullifie* in this life. This like the *Ivy* in the Wall, cut off the Stump, Body, Boughs, Branches of it, yet ſome ſtrings or other will ſprout out again, till the Wall be pluckt down. This, this is that *Colloquintida*, that Death in the Pot, that *Fly-blows* all their Graces, *leavens* all their Comforts, *taints* and *blends* all their Duties. Hence proceed the iniquities of our holy things, *Exod.* 28. 38. This is that, that is able to turn the High Prieſts *Robes* into *Rags*, his *Incenſe* into a *Stench*. Hence came the *humble*, but true *complaint* of the Church, *All our righteouſneſs*, in themſelves, as ours, *are as filthy rags*, Iſai. 64. 6. Mark, we do not ſay as the *Papiſts* falſly charge us, that all that a Believer doth is ſin: but this we ſay, *a Believer ſins*, for the greateſt part, *in all he doth*. The *Work* of God's *Spirit upon us*, and the *Motions* of his *Grace* within us, are pure and holy: but yet, as *clean Water* paſſing through an *unclean* Pipe, receives a *tincture* of that uncleanneſs; ſo *ſinfulneſs* cleaves to our *holieſt* Actions, we the Inſtruments being ſinful. Needs muſt the *Muſick* be inharmonious, when all the *Strings* of the *Lute* are out of *Tune*.

* *Habitat, ſed non regnat; manet, ſed non dominatur, evulſum quodammodo, ſed non expulſum; dejectum, ſed non prorſus ejectum tamen.* Bern. in Pſal. 90. Serm. 10.

Mala mea pure mala ſunt, & mea ſunt: bona autem mea nec pure bona ſunt, nec mea ſunt. Hugo.

Inference.

Is this a Truth? Is the Moral Law of God ſo perfect, ſpiritual, juſt, and good? Doth it indeed require and exact ſuch *perſonal*, *perfect*, and *perpetual* Obedience? Muſt *good*, only good, *all* good, and that in the moſt *intenſe* and higheſt degree, be done, and that from a Divine *Principle*, the Spirit, Faith, Love, in a right *manner*, according to the Di-

vine

vine Word and Will, and to a Divine *End*, the Glory of God? And was there never a Saint yet in the World, that was meer man, that ever did or could *exactly* do what this Law requires, but fell far short of their duty? See here then *the certain downfal of Dagon before the Ark*. Behold here *that arrogant Popish Doctrine of Supererogation, bowing, stooping, falling at the foot of the Truth and Word of God*. Let him that hath an *Ear*, hear and judge. Tell me, if the best of God's Saints, doing their *best*, fall short of *much* which in duty they are *bound* to do, is it possible for a *Popish Shavelling to supererogate, i. e.* to do, yea piously, acceptably, and preterpluperfectly to do, far more than God requires? They are not ashamed to tell the World, That 'tis not only *possible*, but *facile* and ealie for a true Believer *exactly* to keep the whole Law of God, and not to fail a *tittle*. Alas, *Paul* was a man of *low* attaintments, when he *whines* out his Ἐν τελάπινῳ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος. And *David* a *Dwarf* to these *Goliahs*. He indeed stands *wondring and trembling* on the shore of the Ocean, and cries out, *I have seen an end of all perfection, but thy Commandment is exceeding broad*: A great deep, an *unsearchable* gulf, an Ocean without *bank* or *bottom*. But as for them, with their very *Spoon* they'll *lave it*. Alas, 'tis an *easie* leap into the Chair of perfection; that's a *Mark* and White for Souls of a *lower alloy*. But greater Souls are born for greater Exploits. Such *Eagles* as they, scorn to catch at *Flies*, but fly at *Stars*. Nay, 'tis not *Heaven it self*, at least nothing less than the *eleventh* Orb of the *Empyrean* Heavens, can give a proportionable *Treat* to their aspiring Souls. 'Tis for poor penitent Publicans and Sinners, to please themselves in doing, through Christ's strength, what the Lord requires; nothing becomes these Worthies less, than doing *more* than ever entred into God's *heart* to command them. O the *stupendious pride* of *Lucifer*, and of hearts possessed by him. Well, *my Brethren*, I would not be thought to *envy* and pine at their *triumphant* Honour. Only give me leave to conclude this Use, with this *Epiphonema*: viz. *Those that will perform an Obedience that God never commanded, what can they expect less, than an Heaven, that God never created?* But here the *Papist* acts the *Parthian*, and fights flying, *viz.* makes his Objections.

Rom. 7. 24.

Psal. 119. 96.

Vid. vid. Chamier. Tom. 6. l. 20. c. 20.

Object. 1. *Doth God enjoin the Creature that which is impossible?* That were *unjust*, and would highly *intrench* on God's *goodness*.

Sol. This *Arrow* was long since taken out of *Pelagius* his Quiver. To which we reply as *Austin* did: What is *simply* and *absolutely* impossible in it self, God doth not impose upon the Creature. But what apostate Man himself *hath made impossible* to himself, *voluntarily*, and *meerly* by his own default, that the great Lawgiver *may, and doth justly impose*: And this impossibility no way *impeacheth* God's goodness, because the sinner hath *wilfully contracted* and brought it on himself.

If a *Prodigal Spendthrift* hath, by his *Luxury* and *Debauchery*, utterly *disabled* himself to pay his Debts, may not the wronged *Creditors* demand

demand their due, although the Prodigal cannot pay? What though the Sinner hath loſt his *Power*, ſince this is done wilfully and wickedly? certainly God may juſtly demand his *Right*.

Object. 2. But did not Chriſt come in the fleſh for this end, *That we might be able fully to keep the Law in our own perſons, that the righteouſneſs of the Law might be fulfilled in us?*

Rom. 8. 4. *Sol.* Mark, The Scripture ſaith, *In us*, not *by us*. Chriſt came, that the Righteouſneſs of the Law ſhould be fulfilled *for us*, and *in us*, i. e. *imputatively*, but not *by us perſonally*. The bleſſed Jeſus our Head and Repreſentative, and Surety in his own Perſon whilſt here on Earth, did fully obey the Law, *perfectly* conforming to it in all its holy Commands. Now this his moſt perfect Obedience is made over, reckoned and *imputed* to his Members, *Rom.* 5. 19. as if they themſelves, in their own perſons, had performed it. The Laws Righteouſneſs is not fulfilled Rom. 10. 5. *in them formally*, ſubjectively, *inherently*, or *perſonally*, but legally, and *imputatively*, they being in Chriſt as their *Head and Surety*, and ſo Chriſts Obedience becomes ours *by imputation*.

Object. 3. But we find divers *Saints in Scripture recorded for perfect men*; *Noah*, *Job*, *Caleb*, &c.

Sol. *But were they perfect with a ſinleſs perfection?* If you prove not that, you do but beat the Air. We eaſily grant a Perfection of *parts*, we utterly deny Perfection of *degrees*, ſuch as admits not the *leaſt taint* of defect or ſin. We ſay, that men may be very *eminent* in Grace but yet even then not *exactly* conformable to the Law. An *Evangelical* Perfection we admit, 'tis no more than *ſincerity*. A *Legal* Perfection we deny, that in this life is an impoſſibility.

Object. But the Romaniſts flee an *higher* pitch, and not content with *perfect performance* of what is commanded, they tell us, *they can, and do do more:* Crying up their *Evangelical Counſels*, as they call them, for *rare things* indeed, and ſuch as far tranſcend Moral, or *Evangelical Precepts*. He that gives ear to theſe Counſels, and follows theſe, is a *Saint indeed*, and doth indeed *do more* than God requires.

Chamier. Tom. 3. l. 10. c. 20. de Conſiliis. *Sol.* But what are theſe *Evangelical Counſels*, that are diſtinct from *Evangelical Precepts?* *Bellarmine*, *Alphonſus* and *Platus*, concur in their Deſcription of an *Evangelical Counſel*; and they thus decipher it: *It is Chriſt's commending only, but not commanding a good work: which, if not done, doth not at all expoſe to condemnation; but if done, merits a greater degree of Glory; a Coronet at leaſt in Heaven.* A Counſel differs from a Precept in matter, ſubject, form, and end. The *matter* of a Precept is more *facile*, and eaſie: But that of a Counſel more *hard*, and difficult. Obedience to a Precept ſprings from a *Principle of Nature*; but Obedience, or liſtning to a Counſel owes it ſelf to none, but a *ſupernatural Principle*. To obey a Precept is *good*, but to conform to a Counſel *much better*. But then for the *ſubject*. *All* are bound to obey Evangelical Precepts; but *only ſome few* choice ſelect *Privado's* of Hea-

ven

ven are concerned with Evangelical Counſels. The *form* alſo differs. A Precept obliges by *its own proper* Power and Authority to Obedience; but a Counſel leaves it *in the breaſt* and *liberty* of the perſon to whom its given, whether he will follow it, yea or no. *Laſtly*, they differ no leſs in their *end*. The end, or effect of a Precept is a *reward* to him that obeys, *puniſhment* to him that doth not: But the end of a *Counſel* is a *greater reward* to him that obſerves it, but *not the leaſt puniſhment* or frown on him that neglects, and not obſerves it. *But* are there indeed any ſuch *Evangelical Counſels* contra-diſtinct from *Evangelical Precepts?* Yes, ſay the *Papiſts*, and to that end charge us with theſe three Texts, which, they ſay, do all prove that there are ſome *Evangelical Counſels* which fall not under a Command.

Object. 1. *Mat.* 13. 8. But other fell into *good ground*, and brought forth fruit, *ſome an hundred fold*, *ſome ſixty fold*, *ſome thirty fold*. Here, ſaith *Bellarmine*, the Lord compares the Church to *good ground*, whereof one part brought forth *an hundred*, another *ſixty*, another *thirty fold*, and he alleadgeth the Authority of *Hieronymus*, *Cyprian*, and *Auſtin* for this interpretation of this Parable: *viz.* That Chriſt doth here diſtinguiſh between the different merit of *chaſte Marriage*, *Widowhood*, and *Virginity*; and that Virginity is a *greater* good, and more *meritorious* in the ſight of God, than either *chaſte Widowhood*, or *Conjugal Chaſtity*. But this, ſaith *Bellarmine*, is an *Evangelical Counſel* only, not a Command: for what God commands not, and yet commends, and prefers it before other things, he doth, without all doubt, *counſel only*, and adviſe.

Sol. 1. But what Reaſons do thoſe *Fathers* of the Church give for this interpretation? Here *Bellarmine* is ſilent.

2. Let their own *Maldonate* anſwer for us, and Truth. *A Chriſto tantum propoſitum fuit*, *ut doceret omne ſemen*, *&c.* Chriſt's intent here was only this, to teach us, that all ſeed which fell on good ground did ſo multiply, that that which brought forth the *leaſt* increaſe, produced thirty fold, even ſo much, as none but the beſt and moſt cultivated ground was wont to bring forth: that which brought forth moſt, an hundred; the middle good-ground, ſixty; and if this be the genuine ſenſe of the Text, what doth it make for *Bellarmine* in the leaſt, ſeeing *fruitfulneſs* in hearing the Word, and enjoying of *Ordinances*, doth no leſs belong to *Precepts*, than *Counſels?*

Object. 2. *Mat.* 19. 21. Jeſus ſaid unto him, *If thou wilt be perfect*, *go and ſell that thou haſt*, *and give to the poor*, *and thou ſhalt have treaſure in Heaven*, *and come and follow me*. Here, ſaith *Bellarmine*, an Evangelical Counſel is plainly diſtinguiſht from a Precept. The *Precept* we have in his anſwer to the young man's queſtion, Good Maſter, what good thing ſhall I do, that *I may* have eternal life? *viz. Keep the Commandments*; There's the Precept, Verſ. 16. 17. and to obey, that is ſufficient for Salvation. But then he ſubjoins, *If thou wilt be perfect*,

i. e.

i. e. ſaith *Bellarmine*, if thou art *not contented* with bare Eternal Life, but doſt aſpire unto, and breathe after *a more excellent degree* in that Eternal Life, Then go, ſell all, *&c.* Here's the Counſel.

Sol. 1. In theſe words Chriſt doth not give any *Evangelical Counſel* in the Papiſts ſenſe. For

1. No greater reward than bare *Eternal Life* is propoſed by Chriſt to him. Chriſt only ſaith to him, *Thou ſhalt have treaſure in Heaven*; which phraſe is common to all thoſe, to whom the hope of Eternal Life is propoſed: *Matth.* 6. 20. *Lay up for your ſelves treaſures in Heaven.* Now a *bare Heaven*, according to them, is not a *ſufficient* reward for the Obedience of an *Evangelical Counſel.*

2. We utterly deny *Bellarmine*'s *Gloſs* on theſe words, *If thou wilt be perfect*, i. e. if thou aſpire to an excellent degree in Eternal Life: but rather thus, *If by the Obſervation of the Commandments here thou wouldſt obtain Life Eternal hereafter*, 'tis neceſſary that thou ſhouldſt be *perfect* in thy Obſervation of them. But thou art not *perfect*, and therefore, in that way, thou canſt not hope to obtain Eternal Life. Waſt thou *perfect*, thou wouldſt go and ſell all thou haſt, and give to the poor, but this thou wilt not do. The Perfection then that our Saviour intends, is a Perfection of Grace *in this Life*, not an higher *degree of reward in the next.* And that appears,

1. In our Saviour's anſwer to him, *Mar.* 10. 21. *One thing thou lackeſt:* and *Luke* 18. 22. Here our Saviour gives check to his vain boaſting.

2. When he was gone away ſorrowful, mark what our Saviour adds, *A rich man ſhall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, Verſ. 23. He doth not ſay, Shall not obtain a Golden Coronet, or a *greater degree* of Glory; but plainly, He ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Whence it follows, that this young man, becauſe he did not follow our Saviour's counſel, was in danger *of loſing Eternal Life.* Now the Papiſts aſſert, That he that refuſeth to hearken to an *Evangelical Counſel*, ſhall incur *no puniſhment*; and let themſelves be Judges, whether *excluſion* from Heaven be no puniſhment.

Object. 3. 1 *Cor.* 7. 25, 26. &c. *Paul* counſels, but doth not command *Virginity* and *Continency* to the *Corinthians.*

Sol. 1. *It doth not follow*, that becauſe *Paul* ſaith, *I give my judgment*, therefore he doth not command. Compare this with 2 *Cor.* 8. 10. *Herein I give my advice*, γνώμην ἐν τούτῳ δίδωμι. This was concerning Almſdeeds; and do any Papiſts number Exhortations to them among Evangelical Counſels? Or will they admit Marriage to be an Evangelical Counſel? and yet *Paul* adviſeth to it, 1 *Cor.* 7. 2. *To avoid Fornication, let every one have his own wife.*

2. *Evangelical Counſels have always a greater reward in Heaven propoſed to the Obſervers of them.* Read the whole Chapter, and ſee, whether *Paul* holds forth a more *Glorious Crown* to Virginity, yea, whether

ther he doth ſo much as *barely* promiſe *Eternal Life* to it.

3. *Evangelical Counſels are not backt with the intimations of Temporal Commodities*, as theſe are here, Verſ. 26, 28, 34.

Let this ſuffice for the *firſt* Concluſion. I proceed to the *ſecond.*

2. *Were it poſſible for the beſt of Saints perfectly to keep the Law of God, yet even theſe ſuppoſed perfect ones cannot in the leaſt oblige God, or merit any thing from the hand of his Juſtice.* When we have done *all* thoſe things which are commanded us, we are *ſtill unprofitable ſervants* to our Sovereign Lord, we have done *but that which was our duty* to do. As to Merit, *properly* and *ſtrictly* ſo called, *it is the juſt deſert of a voluntary action, whereunto a proportionable reward is due out of Juſtice, ſo that if it be not given, an injury is really committed, and he, to whom retribution properly appertaineth, ſhould be really unjuſt if he did not exactly compenſate.* Some of the *Papiſts* ſoar very high in this point, and tell us *roundly*, that good Works do not only merit in reſpect of God's *Gracious Covenant*, but in regard of the *worthineſs of the Works* themſelves: And that God, for the greater honour of his Children, would have them to get Heaven *by their Merit*, which is more *honourable* to them than to receive it *by God's free gift.* 'Tis not for ſuch *high-born* Souls as theirs humbly to expect and obtain Everlaſting Happineſs, *as a Beggar doth his Alms*; but to *attaque* Heaven by ſtorm, to enter upon, and poſſeſs it, as the *juſt reward* of their Works, and to ride *triumphantly* through it as Conquerors. *Others* of the Papiſts ſeem more *modeſt*, and they tell us, that the Saints do merit indeed, but then *their merits are ſubordinate to Chriſt's merits*; nay, ſay they, they are *derived* from them, for Chriſt hath *merited for us the power and grace of meriting:* And therefore this Doctrine of Merit is *far* enough from *obſcuring* the Glory of Chriſt's Merits: It rather argues the wonderful *efficacy* of them. 'Tis no *blemiſh* to the Sun, that the Moon and Stars ſhine with a *borrowed* Light from it. *Fruitfulneſs* of the Branches is no *diſparagement* to the Vine. The *dependent* and *ſubordinate* efficacy of ſecond Cauſes, is no *detraction* from the *All-ſufficiency* and *Omnipotency* of the firſt. But for all theſe *ſugred* words and fair pretences, we ſhall endeavour to make it evident, that ſuch a fanſied merit of pardon of ſin, and eternal life, even by our beſt works, is an *ungrounded*, novel, *unneceſſary*, impoſſible fiction.

2 *Concluſion.*

Tapperus in Explic. Artic. Lovan. Tom. 2. art. 9.

Bell. de juſt. l. 5 c. 16, 17.

1. *Wholly ungrounded on the Scriptures.* That Chriſt's Merit hath purchaſed for us *Grace* for the performance of good Works, we readily *grant*: but that he hath merited that we might merit, we utterly deny, as being a thing unheard of in the Writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles.

2. *Novel*; 'tis *a new upſtart* Opinion, ſo ſays that *Malleus Jeſuitarum*, the incomparable *Uſher*. In former times of Popery, the ordinary Inſtruction appointed to be given to men on their Death-beds, was, *That they ſhould look to come to glory, not by their own Merits*, but by the *Virtue* and *Merits* of Chriſt's Paſſion; and place *their whole con-*

fidence in his *Death only*, and in *no other thing*, and interpoſe his Death between God and their ſins. This made *William of Wickham*, Founder of New Colledge, profeſs, he truſted in Chriſt alone for Salvation; and *Charles the Eighth* did the like when he came to die; and *Bellarmine himſelf*, when he was at the brink of Eternity, to profeſs, *Tutiſſimum eſt*, &c. give me a Chriſt, rather than all other pretended Merits whatever.

3. *An unneceſſary fiction.* Hath Chriſt a *fulneſs* of Merit, and that of infinite value, to purchaſe *Reconciliation* and *Acceptation* both of our *Perſons* and *Services*, together with an Everlaſting *Inheritance* in the Kingdom of Heaven? Yea, or no? If it be denied, 'tis eaſily proved out of *Dan.* 9. 24, 26. *Col.* 10. 19, 20. *Job.* 17. 2. *Heb.* 9. 12, 15. If it be *granted*, that the Merit of Chriſt is of *infinite* value, and that by it he hath purchaſed in the behalf of his Members a *full right* unto Eternal Life and Happineſs; if Chriſt hath merited for us *perfection*, and fulneſs of Grace and Glory, what *neceſſity* is there that we our ſelves ſhould do this again?

Entia non ſunt multiplicanda ſine neceſſitate.

4. *'Tis impoſſible.* We cannot poſſibly by our *beſt Works* merit Eternal Life. We are ſaved by *Mercy*, not *Merit*, *Rom.* 3. 20. and *Rom.* 4. 2, 4, 6. by *Grace*, not of *Works*, Epheſ. 2. 8, 9. *Tit.* 3. 5, 6, 7. and if by Grace, by Grace *alone*, not by Works, no *blending* of Grace and Works together, *Rom.* 11. 6. To evidence this, let us but duly conſider the neceſſary *Ingredients* of Merit, and apply them to the *beſt Works* of the *beſt of Saints*. To render a Work *properly* and *ſtrictly meritorious* of a reward, 'tis *neceſſary* that

1. *There ſhould be ſome equality, proportion, and ſuitableneſs between the Work and the Reward.* But is there any *equality* betwixt the *enjoyment* of God in Heaven, and *our imperfect* Works on Earth? If I preſent my *Prince* with an *Horſe* or *Dog*, and he requites me with a *Lordſhip*, will any man ſay I have merited that *Lordſhip?* Of all Works none comparable to *Martyrdom:* but yet what compare between a Crown of *Thorns* here, and a Crown of *Glory* hereafter? 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. not worthy to be named the ſame day, *Rom.* 8. 18.

2. *That the Work done be profitable and advantageous to him of whom any thing is merited.* But can a ſinful man *be profitable unto God?* Job 22. 2, 3. and 35. 7, 8. Can a man, he doth not mean an *ordinary*, ſickly, *weak*, frail man, but *a man at his beſt*, a man in the *flower* and *perfection*, not only of his natural abilities, but in the *richeſt Furniture* and *Array* of his *acquired* and inſpired *Perfections*. Take this man, a man of theſe *Attainments* and Accompliſhments, and can *he be profitable* to God? can he bring any *advantage*, gain or profit unto God? Be he never ſo *holy*, never ſo *righteous*, doth the Lord receive any *advantage* by him, ſo as thereby God is his *Debtor*, and become *beholden* to him? No, no. The beſt of men cannot *oblige* God. The great JEHOVAH is *perfect* in himſelf, and therefore cannot receive any *addition*: he is

ſelf-

self-sufficient, and therefore needs no addition. Holy *David* humbly acknowledges this, *Psal.* 16. 2. *My goodness extendeth not to thee: i.e.* I am not able to do any good which reacheth to thy benefit, or increaseth thy happiness. Exod. 19. 5. Deut. 32. 9.

Object. But is not the Church of the Jews called *God's peculiar treasure?* and is there *no profit* in a treasure?

Sol. Yes. They are called his treasure, *not* because they *profit him*, *but* because he *protects* them, as a man would his *treasure* that is most *dear* to him.

Object. But is not *the glorifying of God* an advantage to him?

Sol. Our glorifying of God adds no more to him, than the *reflecting* Glass doth to the most beautiful Face. It only *shews* what God *is*, it doth not *add* to what God *hath:* Nay, at best 'tis but a *dusty crackt Glass*, *Mat.* 5. 16. A little *Taper* adds more Light to the *Sun*, than *all* men do or can to God.

3. *That it be a Work that is not already due.* Doth any man deserve an Estate for that *Money* whereby he *discharges* an old Debt. That which is *our duty* to do, cannot possibly *merit* when 'tis *done*. We cannot oblige either God or man by *performing* our *Obligation*. All the Works we can do for God, are *deserved* by him. Hath not he *created* us? Doth he not every moment *uphold* our Souls in life? Hath he not *redeem'd* us, and so is infinitely before-hand with us every way? Dare any say, that God doth not deserve that they should do *the utmost they can* for his Service and Glory? If he doth, is it not *Pride* and *Impudence* to pretend merit from God? Thus our Saviour argues in *the Text*, where he proves, that, because the servant had done no more *than was his duty to do*, therefore he did not *merit* in doing it: *When ye have done all, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do.* He that hath done all those things that are commanded him, is a man indeed, *a man of worth*, a man of men: but where to be found on Earth? But let it be granted, that he hath reacht to the utmost line of the Command, he is yet *an unprofitable servant*, he hath done *but his duty*. A man of *worth* he may be, a man of *merit* he is not, he cannot be. There neither is, nor can be any good Work acceptable to God, which God hath not commanded. Of all other Works whatever his Query is, *Who hath required them at your hands?* Isai. 1. 12. and if it be commanded, then it is due to God; and if so, then by giving that to God which is his *due*, we do not merit, no not so much *as thanks*, *Luke* 17. 9, 10. We are not our own, we are the Lord's. We are bought with a price, we owe our whole selves for our *Creation* and *Redemption*, 1 *Cor.* 6, 20. and therefore we ought to glorifie God in our *Bodies* and *Souls*, which are the *Lord's*. If we our *Selves*, our *Bodies* and *Spirits* are the Lord's, much more are all our *Services* his. If the Person be anothers, all the work that is or can be done by him are his too.

4. *That, what good Works we do, be our own.* A man cannot merit

by giving that *to* another, which he had *from* him to whom he gave it. A King's *Almoner* merits not by distributing his *Sovereigns* Alms. Now every good gift, and every perfect gift, is *from above*, *Jam.* 1. 17. What hath, or doth the best of Saints, *that he hath not received?* 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. Is it not the *Lord that worketh in them*, both to will and do? *Phil.* 2. 12, 13. Do not all Works that are good, as they are good, proceed from his *Spirit?* Are they not the *Fruits* that spring from that Divine Root? *Gal.* 5. 20. Is not Repentance *his gift? Act.* 11. 18. and 5. 31. Is it not given to us *both to believe and to suffer? Phil.* 1. 29. *Without him*, *can we*, of our selves, *do any thing?* Joh. 15. 5. Nay, can we so much as *think a good thought* of our selves? 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. Is it not he that works *all our works for us*, *and in us?* Isai. 26. 12. And therefore certainly by them God cannot be bound to bestow more upon us.

Durand. in l. 2. Sen. dist. 27. q. 2. Hence *Durandus*, to the great regret of *Merit-mongers*, with much zeal and strength, impugns and contends against the merit of Condignity.

5. *That it be not mixt and tainted with sin.* That Action which needs a *Pardon*, cannot deserve a *Reward*. Can that, for which we deserve *Hell*, and Eternal *Death*, merit *Heaven*, and Eternal *Life?* Now as good Works are wrought by us, they are *defiled* and mixed with so much *weakness* and imperfection, that they cannot endure the severity of God's Judgment, *Isai.* 64. 6. *Gal.* 5. 17. *Rom.* 5. 17, 18. *Psal.* 143. 2. and 130. 3. All our Graces are *imperfect*, all our Duties are *polluted*; and therefore stand in need of *Favour*, Grace and Acceptation: and where then is their merit?

Object. 1. *But is not Eternal Life called a Reward? and doth not that strongly prove merit?* *Mat.* 5. 12. Great is your *Reward.*

Sol. 1. *Compare* Scripture with Scripture, and then judge. Is not Eternal Life said to be the *Gift of God? Rom.* 6. 23. Can a free Gift be *deserved* or merited? Again, is not Eternal Life called *an Inheritance?* Rom. 8. 17. Gal. 4. 7. Ephes. 1. 14, 18. Col. 1. 12. Can the same Estate be mine by *Inheritance*, and by *Purchase?*

Yes, say the Papists. The *Glory* which Christ had, was his by *Inheritance*, for he was Heir of all things, *Heb.* 1. 2. and yet 'twas his by *Purchase* too: He dearly paid for it, *Phil.* 2. 7, 8, 9, 10.

True, but this was *in divers respects*, because he had two Natures: As he was the *Eternal Son* of God, it was his *Inheritance*, and belonged to the Manhood only as united to the Godhead. As he was *Man*, he might, and did *Purchase* it by what he did, and suffered in the flesh. But in Saints there are not two Natures, nor any ground of pretence for Purchase.

2. Doth not the Scripture clearly speak *of two kinds of Rewards*, *of Grace and of Debt?* and withal affirms, that the Reward that God gives to good men, is meerly *of Grace*, not of *Debt*, *Rom.* 4. 4.

Bellarmine tells us it may be of both.

No.

No; The Apoſtle utterly forbids that: If it be of Grace, *then it is it no more of works*, Rom. 11. 6.---4. 4, 5.

Object. 2. But God gives this *reward* to men, *for working in his Vineyard*, Mat. 20. 8.

Sol. True, but ſtill the reward appears *to be of grace*, elſe why ſhould he that came in *at the laſt hour*, receive *as much* as they that had born the heat and burthen of the day? ver. 12.

Object. 3. But God is ſaid to reward men *according to their works*; according to, *i. e.* according to the *proportion* of them, and that implies merit, *Rev.* 20. 13. 2 *Cor.* 11. 15.

Sol. I muſt demur to this gloſs on theſe Texts, and that,

1. Becauſe, ſince God is pleas'd to reward in us his own gifts and graces, not our Merits, as *Bernard* ſpeaks, *He may ſtill keep a proportion, and to them to whom he gave more grace here, he may give more glory hereafter*, and yet there is no more *merit* in this *additional* reward, than in the reſt.

2. I may as well conclude, *the blind men merited their ſight*, becauſe Chriſt ſaith, Be it unto you *according to your Faith*, Mat. 9. 29. as we may gather Merit from this phraſe, *according to your works*.

Object. 4. *Good works mentioned, as the Cauſes, for which God gives eternal Life*, Mat. 25. 35. Come ye bleſſed, &c. *for I was hungry*, and ye gave me meat, &c.

Sol. Paul did not think this a good Argument; for though he knew that it was ſaid of *Abraham*, *Becauſe thou haſt done this thing*, I will bleſs thee: yet he flatly denies the *merit* of *Abrahams works*, Rom. 4. 2, 6. *Gal.* 3. 5. And, when he ſays of himſelf, I obtained mercy, *becauſe I did it ignorantly*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. who can imagine that he means *that his ignorance merited mercy*. The King ſaid, I forgive thee all thy debt, *becauſe thou deſiredſt me*, Mat. 18. 32. Did his *meer asking* deſerve it? Gen. 22. 16, 17.

Object. 5. *Good men own'd by God, as worthy of the Kingdom of God*, 2 Theſſ. 1. 5. Rev. 3. 4.

Sol. Theſe are ſaid to be *worthy*, not as the *Labourer is worthy of his hire*, Mat. 10. 10. Luke 10. 7. 1 Tim. 5. 17, 18.

1. But *Comparatively*, in reſpect of *other men*, that are moſt *unworthy*.

2. *By Gods gracious acceptation of them, in, and through Chriſt*, Acts 5. 41. Mat. 22. 8. But otherwiſe the *holieſt* of Saints have ever judged themſelves moſt *unworthy* of the leaſt of God's mercies. So far have they been from *proudly* thinking themſelves worthy of eternal life. A worthineſs *of fitneſs and meetneſs* for Heaven in Saints we acknowledge, as the word ἀξιος is rightly rendred, *Matt.* 3. 8. and yet it is God's grace alone that gives the Saints this fitneſs; *Col.* 1. 12. 'Tis God alone that makes us thus *meet to be partakers* of the inheritance of the Saints in light. 'Tis therefore no leſs than *impudence* to pretend to *merit* from God by it: and if yet any will be ſo *audacious* as to boaſt Gen. 32. 10. Mat. 8. 8. Luke 7. 6, 7. 2 Theſ. 1. 3. Phil. 1. 27. Luke 21. 35. 2 Theſ. 1. 5. Col. 1. 12.

of

of their own worth and merit, let them be pleaſed to anſwer the Apoſtle's cloſe, and cutting queſtions; 1 *Cor.* 4, 7. Who *maketh thee to differ*? and what *haſt thou*, that thou didſt not *receive*? now if thou didſt receive it, why doſt thou *glory* as if thou didſt not receive it?

Uſe 1. *Infer.* 1. If then legal, *ſinleſs* Perfection, and merit *for our ſelves* by our beſt works, notwithſtanding all its *plauſible pretexts*, ſtands convicted, and caſt, *what ſhall we think of works of Supererogation*? what intollerable *arrogance*, boldly, and without a *bluſh* to affirm, that *divers of the Saints have not only merit enough to purchaſe eternal life for themſelves, but a great deal to ſpare for the relief of others.* This ſelf-advancing, and *heaven-daring* Doctrine of works of *Supererogation*, what ſelf-ſearching ſoul is there that looks not on it as the higheſt *ſtrain*, two or three notes at leaſt above *Ela*, indeed ſuch a note, as not the holieſt *Teraphim*, *Seraphim*, *Arch-Angel*, durſt ever yet pretend to reach to, no not in their higheſt *Halelujahs*. *Supererogation*! both the word and thing point out to us the *Top Round* of the Popiſh Arrogancy. Or if you pleaſe, you may look upon it as the grand *Bellows of the Popes Kitchin* here, and of his *comfortable importance*, his moſt beneficial *Laboratory*, viz. *Purgatory*, hereafter.

The *Papiſts* jumble in this Doctrine among the croud of ſeveral other ungrounded, *unſcriptural*, novel, and *abſurd* opinions. And, that you may ſee that it is much *beneath* theſe grand *Sophy's*, *vel delirare, vel inſanire, niſi cum ratione*, thus they erect their *Babel*. A *Lanſcape* whereof is exactly drawn by the skilful *pencil* of the *truly Reverend and Learned Davenant.*

Dav. in Coloſ. 1. 24.

1. Firſt then they readily acknowledg and declare, *that God-man Chriſt Jeſus did fully ſatisfie the Juſtice of God by his offering up of himſelf a ſacrifice for ſin, and that by that Sacrifice did fully expiate the ſins of Believers.* A truth this written with a *Sun-beam.* But then with the *Text*, you muſt take the *Popiſh Comment* too. This ſatisfaction and expiation, ſay they, is to be underſtood only in reſpect of their guilt of *mortal ſins*, and of their *eternal* puniſhment due thereupon, but not at all in reſpect of their *temporal* puniſhment. As for *this*, they are wholly left to themſelves, either to *ſink* or *ſwim*; and notwithſtanding all that Chriſt hath done, *ſuffered*, purchaſed, *promiſed*, Believers are ſtill *liable* to it, and that not only in the *preſent* World, but for ſome time, at leaſt in the *next*, *i*, *e.* in *Purgatory.*

To follow them κατὰ πόδας ſtep by ſtep.

Culpam remitti, nihil aliud eſt, quam non imputari ad pœnam Durand. l. 4.

1. As to that pretty *new-coin'd* diſtinction between the *full remiſſion* of the *guilt* of ſin, and yet *inflicting* of the *puniſhment* after the pardon of the *guilt*. Tell me, what is *guilt*? is it not *a liableneſs and being bound over to puniſhment?* Is it any thing more or leſs: therefore if the *guilt* be taken away, of neceſſity the *puniſhment* muſt be taken away alſo. All puniſhment reſults from *guilt*, and from guilt alone, and there-

therefore if there be a full *expiation of that*, the punishment must needs cease, let the *kind* of it be what it will. If a sin be *remitted*, pardoned, *forgiven*, it cannot in equity be *punished*. All punishment in order to satisfaction of justice is utterly *inconsistent* with the nature and tenor of *remission* of sin. 'Tis a great and known *maxim*, *In sublata culpa, tollitur & pœna*; and backt by the concurrent testimony of the Ancient. The truth is, to affirm the contrary, is to make remission of sin a meer *Bauble*, or rather a *Taunting* jeer, or stinging *Sarcasm*. As if a *Creditor* should say to his *Debtor*, poor soul, I freely *forgive* thee all thou owest me, only I must throw thee into a *Dungeon* full of Scorpions and Serpents, and these must sting and torment thee *years without number*; but for thy comfort, know, that 'tis not for the *millions* but *mites* thou owest me. *Purgatory*-fire is not for *mortal* but *venial* sins, little peccadillo's. Or as if a *Judge* or *King* should cause an *O yes* to be made, and then proclaim a free and gracious *pardon* to a desperate *malefactor*, or rather to his own prodigal, *rebellious Son*; thus, Son, I do, before Men and *Angels*, and in the face of the whole World, *freely forgive* you all your debaucheries, *rebellions*, treasons, I frankly quit you from the *guilt* of all your bloody crimes, only I remember *some little incogitancies*, some slight slips of your youth; and these I must not, cannot pardon. For *these* therefore, such is my tender compassion, you shall only be stretch'd, and held on a *Rack*, thrown on a burning *Gridiron*, feed on *flames* of Sulphur, and have plentiful *draughts* of scalding-*lead*.--- O brethren, what humane ear could bear such *stabbing* language? *Mutato nomine de Papicolis narratur fabula.*

Exempto reatu eximitur & pœna, Tert. de Bapt. c 5. ὅπου συγχώρησις, ἐκεῖ μία κόλασις, Chrys. hom. 8. ad Rom.

2. *Hath not Christ by his perfect Obedience and Sacrifice of himself fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased perfect reconciliation?* By the *obedience* of that one man, the second *Adam*, *are not many*, even all elected, converted, believing, penitent sinners *made righteous before God*? *Rom.* 5. 19. Hath not Christ by one offering *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified? *Hebr.* 10.14. Doth not the Blood of Christ *throughly purge our Conscience* from the *guilt* of dead works as well as *filth*? *Heb.* 9. 14. Hath not Christ loved us, *and given himself for us an offering, and a Sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour to all* gracious intents and purposes? *Eph.* 5. 2. Did not Christ by his death *finish the transgression*, and make an end of sins? Hath he not made *perfect reconciliation* for iniquity, and brought in *everlasting Righteousness*? *Dan.* 9. 24, 26. *Col.* 1. 19, 20. *Rom.* 3. 24, 25, 26.

Vere Christus communicando nobiscum sine culpa pœnam, & culpam solvit, & pœnam, August.

3. *Where do we find in the whole Scripture, any the least hint of such a restriction or limitation*, that Christ hath satisfied for *eternal* and not for *temporal* punishment? Did he not bear the one as well as the other? *Isa.* 53. 4, 5. Surely he hath born *all* our griefs, carried *all* our sorrows, is wounded for *all* our transgressions, bruised for *all* our iniquities, the chastisement of our *whole* peace was upon him, and by his *stripes only* we are *fully* healed. The *indefinites* in the Text clearly include

clude an universal. *Christ his own self bare all our sins*, that is, the guilt and punishment of them *in his body on the Tree, and therefore* doubtless takes off from the sinner what he bare in his own person, 1 *Pet.* 2.24.

4. But tell me, *Papists*, suppose you laid your ear close to that *fiery dungeon* of Purgatory, and should there hear *elected Believers*, such for whom Christ hath eternal *love*, and particularly *died*, and such as are truly *regenerated* and adopted; (for none but such are there, according to your selves): Suppose, I say, you heard an *Asa*, an *Hezekiah*, a *Jehoshaphat*, a *Mary Magdalen*, nay one of your own most holy *Popes*, (who all have had their little slips, *venial* sins at least) yelling, *howling*, crying out with *Dives, wo is us, wo is us*, for we are *tormented* in this flame. And, though they cannot, *dare* not in the least *murmur* against, or impatiently complain of God, (that were a *mortal* sin, not committable in *Purgatory*) yet might they not without offence complain to God in such language as this: *Ah dear Father*, the Father of thy *dearest* Son our only *Surety and Saviour*, who now sits at thy right-hand, and where one day *we shall* sit near him; wert not thou *he* that didst most *freely* and faithfully promise us, when we were on earth, to *blot out* all our sins as a cloud, and our transgressions as a mist? *Isa.* 43.25. To *cover* them with the robes of thy Son's Righteousness? *Psal.* 32. 1, 2. To cast all our sins into the *depth of the Sea*? *Mic.*7. 18,19. *Not to impute* our trespasses? *Rom.* 4. 8. Yea, though they were sought for, *that they should not be found*? *Isa.* 26. *Never to mention them more*? *Ezek.* 18. 22. Nay, never to *remember* them more? *Jer.* 31.34. Ah dear Father, were these indeed thy *promises*, and didst thou in our life-time, *by thy Spirit, seal* to our Consciences the faithful performance of them? and is this thy performance of them? Is this thy kindness to thy friend? as once *Rebeccah*, if it be so, *why are we thus*? *Gen.* 25. 22. Is all thy promised *mercy* come to this? O consider and see *whether there be any sorrow greater than our sorrow*, which is done unto us, wherewith the Lord himself, our Father, and not the Divel, hath afflicted us, *in the day of his fierce anger.* True indeed, our *mountains* are buried in the depth of the Sea, but our *molehills* sink us; all our *talent-debts* are paid, but we lie, and rot, and burn, and die, for some *little fees.* Tell me, *Papists*, if you heard such a complaint as this, would it not make your *bowels* to wamble? would you not be apt to bid 'em *hush*, and be still, for fear, lest it should be nois'd in *Gath*, and blab'd abroad in the streets of *Askelon*; lest that on the other side of the wall, in *Hell*, (which, you say, stands but the next wall to *Purgatory*), a damned *Caitiff* should hear it, and say, *Aha, aha*, thus would we have it; thus, oh thus let all those be served, and saved, that, while they lived on earth, *believed on*, and were *obedient to a crucified Jesus.* In one word, for God to elect, *redeem*, regenerate, *justify, adopt, sanctify*, accept, *promise*, swear, and to do yet much more for pardoned sinners on earth, and yet in a

vindictive

Vindictive way, in order to the *ſatisfaction* of Juſtice, thus to puniſh, what is it leſs than the higheſt *contradiction?*

Object. 1. But we muſt not think the learned *Bellarmine* will be ſo eaſily *muzzled: bark* he will and muſt, though *bite* he cannot. If Chriſt, ſaith he, ſatisfied for all the fault and puniſhment, *why then do we ſuffer ſo many evils after the remiſſion of guilt?* Doth not God lay many evils on pardoned perſons? Was not *Moſes* pardoned as to his raſh anger, but yet *muſt die* in *Mount Nebo* for his treſpaſs? *Deut.* 32. 48. *&c.* The *Iſraelites* pardoned, but yet *puniſhed*, *Numb.* 14. 20, 21, 22, 23. *David* pardoned, but yet the *Child* muſt die, and the Father ſtabb'd through the Child's loins, 2 *King.* 12. 14. Bellarm. de Purg. l. 1. c. 10.

Sol. 1. Theſe are not *properly* and *ſtrictly puniſhments.* True, *materially* they look like ſuch, and may be owned as ſuch, but not *formally.* Fatherly *Chaſtiſements* they are, Legal *Puniſhments* they are not: *Medicinal*, but not *Penal: Rhubarb*, not *Poiſon: Lancets* only, not *Stilletto*'s: Ligaments, not Halters. They do not come from God's *Vindictive* Wrath, nor doth he in the leaſt deſign them for the *ſatisfaction* of his Juſtice; but they proceed from other *cauſes*, and are deſigned for other *ends.* They are the Iſſues of his Paternal *love* and tenderneſs, *Heb.* 12. 5, 6. *Rev.* 3. 19. To make them more *ſenſible* of the evil of ſin, *Jer.* 4. 18. To *prove* their Graces, *Deut.* 8. 16. To *purge* their Conſciences, *Iſai.* 27. 9. *Refine* their Spirits, *Zech.* 13. 9. 1 *Pet.* 1. 6. and to *ſave* their Souls, 1 *Cor.* 11. 32. 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. For God *thus* to afflict and puniſh, may very well ſtand with pardoning Grace; but to puniſh under any notion of *ſatisfaction*, ſave only that of Chriſt, cannot.

Object. 2. *Death is the wages of ſin*, Rom. 6. 23. *and yet the righteous*, though all their ſins are forgiven in Chriſt, *are not delivered from death.*

Sol. 1. At the laſt day they *ſhall be delivered* from death it ſelf, 1 *Cor.* 15. 26, 55.

2. In death, are delivered from *the ſting and curſe* of death, 1 *Cor.* 15. 56. *Heb.* 2. 75.

3. In that they die, *this is out of God's love*, Iſai. 57. 1, 2. 2 *King.* 22. 20. And that becauſe,

1. It frees them *perfectly* from ſin and miſery, *Epheſ.* 5. 26, 27. *Rev.* 14. 13.

2. It makes them *capable* of further *Communion* with God in Glory, which they then enter upon, *Luke* 23. 43. *Phil.* 1. 23.

Thus much as to their firſt Aſſertion, we proceed to the *ſecond.*

II. They tell us, That *for the preventing or removing of theſe temporal puniſhments both here and in Purgatory*, (notwithſtanding the fulneſs of Chriſt's ſatisfaction and merit) there muſt be *humane ſatisfactions made to God by Believers themſelves, and that for themſelves or others.* At this hole creep in a world of *Popiſh* Vanities: Hence ſevere *Penances*, frequent *Faſtings*, late *Vigils*, tedious *Pilgrimages*, bloody corporal *Laſh-*

ings, voluntary *Poverty*. All these are *Humane satisfactions before* death. *After* death, *Masses*, *Prayers*, *Dirges*, *Indulgences*, *Pardons*, these for them that at their death are *pinion'd up*, and carried bound to *Purgatory*, and this only for *venial* sins, such as break no *square* at all betwixt God and Souls, such as do *not deserve the loss* of God's favour, nor *exclusion* from Heaven to *Purgatory*, I say, whose flames, and *exquisite* torments differ nothing from those of *Hell* but only in *duration*, the *one* being but for a time, the *other* everlasting.

As to this fine device of *Humane satisfaction* by Believers for themselves or others, we demand,

1. In Christ's Humiliation, *Was there a fulness, an all-fulness of satisfaction*, to make an ample *amends* to God's enraged Justice, yea, or no? If it be denied, doubted, or disputed, by the Socinian, or Papist, we thus prove it. The fulness of Christ's satisfaction is,

1. *Most clearly typified in the Old Testament*, in those three famous instances, the *burning* of the Sacrifices by fire from Heaven, *Lev.* 1. 9. *Judg.* 6. 17, 21. 2 *Chron.* 7. 1, 3. and made them ascend towards the place of God's glorious possession. The *compleatness* of the daily bloody Sacrifice, *Exod.* 29. 40. The *sweetness* of the things required in the Meat and Drink-Offering, *Exod.* 29. 40. *Lev.* 2. 2, 15. All these Types of the fulness of Christ's satisfaction.

2. *Plainly asserted in the New Testament*, Ephes. 5. 2. Christ hath given himself for us, *an Offering and a Sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour*. Wherein observe these two things:

1. *The Sufficiency:* An *Offering* and a *Sacrifice* to God.

2. *The fragrancy and acceptableness unto God of the Offering and Sacrifice of Christ*. Christ's Offering and Sacrifice of himself was as acceptable unto God, as the *sweetest Odours* are unto mens sense of smelling.

3. *Really evidenced by Christ's Exaltation, as an evident sign or token thereof*. Christ was thrown into the *Prison* of the Grave, as our *Surety*, for our sins, and no possibility of *delivery* of him thence, but by paying the *utmost* farthing we *owed* unto God's Justice. But now, as the Prophet saith, *He was taken from Prison and Judgment*, Isai. 53. 8. raised from the dead, *taken up into Heaven*, placed at God's right hand, 1 *Cor.* 15. 4. *Mark* 16. 19. there admitted into the glorious exercise of an Authoritative Intercession, *Heb.* 7. 25. A most *convincing* Argument that he hath paid off all our debt, given *full recompence* to God's displeased Holiness, sufficient *satisfaction* to his Justice provoked by our sins. Hereupon that of our Saviour, *John* 16. 8, 10. The Comforter will *convince the World of Righteousness, because I go to my Father: i. e.* The Spirit shall *convince* the World, not only that Christ was righteous, or innocent in his own person, and therefore unjustly numbred among transgressors; *but that there was Righteousness enough in him for the justification of the whole World of his Elect:* and the Argument whereby he proves

it,

it, is, *Because I go to my Father.* Our ſins and God's Juſtice would have kept Chriſt ſtill in his Grave, and never admitted him into Heaven, till he had fulfilled all Righteouſneſs: *i. e.* till he had performed all the Duties, and ſuffered the whole curſe of the Law as touching the ſubſtance thereof, for thoſe for whom he lived and died a Surety. On this it is that *Paul* firmly grounds his *triumphing* confidence, and *bids defiance* to Sin, Law, Death and Devils, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. with *Rom.* 4. 25.

4. Plain, *From the infinite Worthineſs of his Perſon*; and that whether you conſider Chriſt's *Humiliation* under the notion of a *Price*, or *Sacrifice*.

1. *As a Price which he paid for us*, of great and ineſtimable value, by reaſon of the Worthineſs of his Perſon. The precious Blood of Chriſt, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. the Blood of God, *Act.* 20. 28. A full, and ſufficient *Price of ranſom*, Pſal. 130. 7, 8. From the *guilt* and *dominion* of ſin, from the *curſe* and *rigor* of the Law, all ſteps and *degrees* of Salvation, from *all* ſins, all evil that is in ſin, all the ſad and miſerable *conſequents* and effects of ſin. And a ſufficient *Price of Purchaſe* to obtain love, kindneſs, life, righteouſneſs, favour and acceptance, together with all the gracious and glorious *fruits* thereof.

2. *As a Sacrifice, which he offered for us*, an all-pleaſing Sacrifice, by reaſon of the Infiniteneſs of his Perſon. *By one Offering for ever perfected thoſe that are ſanctified*, Heb. 10. 14. The great *acceptableneſs* of this Sacrifice unto God, proceeds from the Dignity of the *Prieſt* offering, the Eternal *Son of God*, in whom God was infinitely well-pleaſed, *Mat.* 3. 17. From the *Sacrifice* offered, the Blood ſhed was the *Blood of God*, Act. 20. 28. From the *Altar* on which 'twas offered, the *Divine Nature*, *Heb.* 9. 14. Tell me then, is there in Chriſt's Humiliation an *all-fulneſs* of ſatisfaction to Divine Juſtice, yea, or no? If ſo, *What need then in the leaſt of this fig-leaf of Humane ſatisfaction?* To what purpoſe do we light up a *dim Taper*, and a *ſmoaky* Candle, when we have before us the *clear* and full *light* of a mid-day *Sun?* If Chriſt's *ſatisfaction* be of infinite price, why may it not ſerve for the *expiation* of the guilt of *Temporal*, as well as *Eternal* puniſhment? If there be an *all-ſufficiency* in Chriſt's ſatisfaction, what need the *ſupplement* of ours?

Object. 1. Did not *Paul rejoice in his ſufferings for the Church, and fill up that which was behind of the afflictions of Chriſt in his fleſh, for his Bodies ſake which is the Church?* Col. 1. 24.

Sol. A great difference betwixt *ſuffering* for the *good* of others, and *ſatisfying* for the *fault* and *guilt* of others. A *Paul* may do the *former*, a Chriſt only can do the *latter*. And this was the *ſole* cauſe of *Paul*'s rejoycing, the great *benefit* that accrued to the *Church* by his *ſuffering*. True indeed, *Paul* is ſaid to *fill up*, *&c.* not as if there were any thing *lacking* or *defective* in the ſufferings of Chriſt, *Heb.* 10. 14.

and 7. 25. but by the ſufferings of Chriſt our Spiritual means, *not Chriſt perſonal*, but *Chriſt myſtical*, that is, the *Body Chriſt*, or true Believers, *i. e.* Chriſt in his Members, who are uſually called Chriſt, *Act.* 9. 4. 2 *Cor.* 1. 5. *Heb.* 11. 25. When Chriſt had done ſuffering in his Perſon, he left it as a *Legacy* to his *Members*, that they ſhould *ſuffer with him*, and for him, *Act.* 9. 16. and 14. 22. 2 *Tim.* 3. 12. Well then, *Paul* ſuffers for the Church: but how? ſo as to ſatisfie God's Juſtice for them? *Oh no.* *Paul* rejects this ſenſe with indignation, *Was Paul crucified for you?* 1 Cor. 1. 13. But as he is ſaid ſometimes to ſuffer for Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 12. 10. not ſurely to *ſatisfie* for him, but to *glorifie* him; ſo he ſuffers for the *Churches edification*, and *eſtabliſhment*, and ſo he elſewhere explains himſelf, *Phil.* 1. 12. 2 *Tim.* 2. 10. Hence it is, that 2 *Tim.* 2. 9. he is ſaid to labour in the Word even unto bonds. Nor doth *Paul* think by his *ſufferings* to *redeem* others from their ſuffering, but by his *example* to excite them to the ſame *conſtancy*: wherefore he ſaith, he ſuffered all things for the Elect, not that they ſhould expect *ſatisfaction* for their ſins in the *merit* of his ſufferings, but that they might *obtain* the *Salvation* that is in Chriſt.

Object. Here the *Papiſts* gravely reply upon us, *Not to ſupply the wants or defects of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, but to apply it unto us.* 'Tis one of the *Inſtruments* ordained by God, for the *application* of Chriſt's ſatisfaction to us in the taking away of *Temporal* puniſhment.

Sol. *Quid verba audiam*, ſhew us the *leaſt tittle* of ground for this *Harangue* in the Book of God.

1. *A new ſatisfaction no more required* to apply the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, *than a new Death*, Redemption, Reſurrection is, to apply the Death, Redemption, and Reſurrection of Chriſt.

2. By their own *limitation* and *reſtriction* of the uſe of Chriſt's ſatisfaction. *They limit the uſe of Chriſt's ſatisfaction*, to the taking away the *fault* only, and that of *mortal* ſins alone, and *eternal* puniſhment due for them; and how then can *Humane* ſatisfaction apply the ſatisfaction of Chriſt for the taking away of *Temporal* puniſhment?

3. Theſe pretended Humane ſatisfactions are *no Inſtruments* of *application* of Chriſt's ſatisfaction: for ſuch Inſtruments are all *Ordinances* of God, branches of his *Worſhip*, ſo are not the pains of *Purgatory*. Beſides, all means of applying the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, proceed from the *Grace*, mercy and favour of God; pains of *Purgatory* from God's *Juſtice*, and are of a deſtructive nature.

3. Theſe pretended Humane ſatisfactions are very *injurious* unto, and *derogatory* from Chriſt's *ſatisfaction*; in that

1. *They make Chriſt's ſatisfaction to be imperfect*, in that it adds thereunto a ſupply of Humane ſatisfaction.

Object. So far from *derogating* from the *Dignity* of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, as they *rather* make to the greater *Honour* thereof, becauſe it deriveth all our power of *ſatisfying* from Chriſt's *ſatisfaction*. 'Tis no *derogation* from

from God's Omnipotency, that he works by ſecond Cauſes; that in working the greateſt Miracles, he makes uſe of the *meaneſt* Servants. No *impeachment*, but rather an honour to Chriſt's *ſatisfaction*, to have it advanced ſo far, as that by *virtue* thereof the Members of Chriſt are made *in part* Satisfiers of Divine Juſtice.

Sol. One tittle of Scripture-proof for this, or elſe the *Proteſtant's Negation* is as *authentick* as the *Papiſt's Aſſertion.*

2. *It communicates to man power of ſatisfying, which is the peculiar and incommunicative Prerogative of Chriſt alone.* This appears from *two* grand fruits of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, proper and peculiar thereunto, *viz. Redemption*, and *Reconciliation.*

1. *Redemption.* Chriſt alone hath redeemed us, *Gal.* 3. 13. Now if *Redemption* be not communicated, *ergo* not *ſatisfaction*; for Redemption is founded on ſatisfaction. Now *Papiſts* themſelves acknowledge no Mediator of Redemption beſides him, *Heb.* 1. 3.

2. *Full and perfect Reconciliation with God*, Rom. 5. 10. Col. 1. 21, 22. Theſe and like places to be underſtood excluſive. *Reconciled to God*, *i.e.* only by Chriſt's Blood and Death, *Iſai.* 53. 5. No *Chaſtiſement* whatever, beſide that of his, can pacifie God's wrath againſt us, or can procure our peace with him. *Papiſts* acknowledge, that nothing which ſinful man can do or ſuffer, is able to purchaſe the return of God's favour and friendſhip: ſo then if mens beſt works and greateſt ſufferings cannot reconcile us unto God, neither can they ſatisfie the Juſtice of God, becauſe Reconciliation of God to man follows ſatisfaction to his Juſtice; and if God be once fully and perfectly reconciled, no place for any other puniſhment, *though but temporal*, becauſe the Friends of God, and Members of Chriſt cannot be *condemned.* 2 Cor. 5. 19. Pſal. 51. 9. and 103. 12. Iſai. 38. 17. and 1. 8.

Obj. *But Humane ſatisfactions are to us very conſiderable, Bonus odor lucri.* The *vaſt* and ſweet *profits*, the large *Incoms* and *Revenues* which theſe bring to the Diſpenſers of them. This *Fabula meritorum*, (like that *Fabula Chriſti*, as one of their *Popes* ſaid, and he ſpake *like himſelf*) is not eaſily to be parted with. Methinks I hear their good Brother *Demetrius*, clapping them on the ſhoulder, and crying, *Euge, Macte*, Go on, *Noble Souls*, go on and proſper. Alas, *Silver Shrines* for the great *Diana* are in danger, yea her Holineſs her ſelf is in danger; and not ſhe, or not ſo much *ſhe*, as *we*, *Our Craft is in danger to be ſet at nought*, *Act.* 19. 24, &c.

Sol. Pardon me, if here I make no reply, but ingenuouſly confeſs, with that *Learned* and *Worthy Brother*, in his late excellent and *ſinewy* Tract on *Rom.* 8. that I cannot anſwer it. But, this being taken away, *I aſſure my ſelf*, ſaith he, *this Controverſie would ſoon be at an end.* 'Tis the ſatisfying of *corrupt men* in their *pride* and *avarice*, and filthy lucre, rather than the ſatisfying of a *puniſhing* God, that is at the bottom of this Controverſie. Dr. *Jacomb.*

Thus much as to the ſecond Romiſh Poſition.

III. *There-*

III. *There have been*, say the Papists, *now are, and still will be in the Church some eminent and transcendent Saints*, such as the Virgin *Mary*, *John Baptist*, St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, *Ignatius Loiola*, St. *Dominic*, St. *Francis*, and many signal Martyrs and Confessors, *that*, by the assisting Grace of God vouchsafed to them in this life, and the wise improvement of their own free-will, *have been enabled perfectly, and personally, and perpetually to keep the whole Law of God*; and by this, have merited Eternal Life for themselves, and greater degrees of Glory: Nay more, not only so, not only done *all the good which the Lord required*, or only just so much as the Law demanded; not only given the Lord good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, *but even running over*, i. e. by lending an obedient ear *to God's Evangelical Counsels*, which are things of greater moment by far with Papists, than God's Moral Precepts, they have even done *more than the Law demands*, more than was needful to be done by them for the obtaining of Eternal Salvation, and have suffered more grievous torments than their sin deserved: and *by both*, have most plentifully *merited* for others. The vanity and *rottenness* of this third suggestion, I suppose I have sufficiently evidenced in the proof of my *first* and *second* Proposition, and therefore hasten to the next Assertion of the Papists, which is,

Concil. Trid. sec. 6. c. 18. Bell. de Justif. lib. 4. c. 10.

IV. *These redundant and over-flowing meritorious actions and sufferings of eminent Saints, being mixed and jumbled together with the superabundant satisfaction of Christ*, (concerning which *Clement* 6th tells us, that one drop of Christ's Blood was sufficient for the Redemption of all Mankind, as if all the rest might have been well spared) *are*, say they, *deposited in the Churches hands as a common Stock and Treasury.*

Fifthly and lastly, *The Key of this Church-Treasury is committed by God to the whole and sole care and disposal of his Holiness the Pope himself*, the whole Treasury to be disposed of by him and his Delegates, and to be applied to poor, penitent, and contrite sinners, that so by the *Popes* Bull and *Indulgencies* they may enjoy the benefit of those merits, and be delivered either from *Church-Censures* on Earth, or the pains of *Purgatory*, next door to Hell.

To both these I shall briefly say but thus much, *Et risum teneatis amici?* or rather, *Quis talia fando temperet a Lachrymis?* This, this was the thing that first raised the Spirit of that *German Elijah*, to put his life into his hand, and in the strength of his God to go out against the *Romish Goliah*. Pope *Leo* had gratified his dear Sister *Magdalene* with a large *Monopoly* of *German* Pardons. *Aremboldus* her Factor was a little too covetous, and held the Market *too high*. The heighth of his overrated Ware, caused the *Chapmen*, and among the rest, *Luther*, a little more *narrowly* to inspect their worth, and they were soon found to be, what indeed they are, a *novel*, and *irrational* vanity, an *upstart* Opinion; not known saith *Cornelius Agrippa*, *Polidore Virgil*, and *Machiavel*,

Luther.

to

to the Churches, till the year 1300. in *Boniface* the Eighth his days, who was the first that extended Indulgencies to *Purgatory*, and the first that devised the *Jubilee*, which is indeed the *Mart* or Market for the full uttering of them.

But to let pass the *Novelty*, do but seriously weigh the *sinfulness* of this Opinion. 'Tis grounded on a supposed merit in Saints. Now *merit is that which purchaseth a thing* de novo, *which we had not before, and to make that due which one had not before, but may now lay just claim to.* If so, how deeply *derogatory* is this opinion to the fulness of Saints merit, to purchase all reconciliation and acceptation both of our persons and services, together with an everlasting Inheritance in the Kingdom of Heaven, *Dan.* 9. 24, 25, 26. *Col.* 1. 19, 20. *Joh.* 17. 2. *Heb.* 9. 12, 15. If the *merit of Christ* be of infinite value, and that by it he hath *purchased* in behalf of us his Members a *full right* unto eternal life and happiness, then their good works do not make the same newly due. If they make it any way due, either in whole, or in part: If in *whole*, then Christ hath merited nothing for them; if in *part*, then something of eternal life there is, which Christ hath not merited: either way there is a manifest *derogation* from the merits of Christ.

As for that *Ignis fatuus of Purgatory*, I refer you to the learned Labours of my *Reverend* Brother, that in this Book professedly treats of that subject.

I have done with the *self-advancing* Papist. A few words more to the *self-abhorring Reformed Protestant*, and I have done.

Use 2. *Exhortation.*

1. *Be sincerely careful to maintain and practise good works*, and that with all your *might*, even to the *end* of your days, *Tit.* 3. 8. *Dorcas* was full of good works, *Act.* 9. 36. Yea, *provoke one another to love, and to good works*, Heb. 10. 24. Let not this thought; *that you cannot*, when you have done all, *either merit, or supererogate* by them, tempt you to *neglect* the holy, faithful, humble, constant performance of them. Do them then, but do them *for necessary uses*, for the noble *ends* by God prescribed. Not for this end, as if by them to merit or supererogate; leave that design to the *Pharisaical* Papist. But *in all your Obedience*, active, passive, aim directly,

1. *At the evidencing of the truth, and liveliness of your faith*, Jam. 2. 18, 22. To *shew your faith by your works*. *Abraham*'s faith was *made perfect* by his works. Not as if *Abraham*'s faith received its worth, value and perfection from his works, but made perfect, *i. e. made known and discovered*, as God's *strength is said to be perfected in our weakness*. Or thus, his faith co-working with his obedience, was made perfect, *i. e. bettered and improved*, as the inward vigour of your spirits is *increased* by motion and exercise.

Opera non sunt causa, quod aliquis justus sit apud Deum, sed potius sunt manifestationes justitiæ. Aquin. 2 Cor. 12. 9.

2. At the manifestation of your thankfulness. Thus *David*, *Psal.* 116. 12, 13. *What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits* towards me?

me? *I will take the Cup of Salvation*, and call upon the Name of the Lord. To *ſhew forth the praiſes* of him, who hath called you out of darkneſs into his marvellous light.

1 Pet. 2, 9.
1 Pet. 1. 5, to 11

3. *At the ſtrengthening of your aſſurances of God's ſpecial love towards you.* Hereby *ye ſhall know that you know him, if ye keep his Commandments*, that in you verily the love of God may be perfected, *and that hereby you may know that you are in him*, 1 Joh. 2. 3, 5.

4. *At the edification of your Brethren, that your Zeal may provoke very many*, as that of the Brethren of *Achaia* did thoſe of *Macedonia*, 2 *Cor.* 9. 2. Let your *light ſo ſhine before men*, not that they may magnifie you, but *glorifie your Father which is in Heaven*, Mat. 5. 16.

5. *At the adorning of your profeſſion of the Goſpel, and ſtopping of the mouths of adverſaries*, Tit. 2. 5, 9, to 13. 1 Tim. 6. 1. 1 Pet. 2. 15.

6. Chiefly and principally *at the Glory of God*, 1 Cor. 10. 31. Let your *Converſation be ſo honeſt*, that, whereas they ſpeak againſt you as evil doers, though their Corruptions accuſe you, their Conſciences may acquit you, *that they may by your good works which they ſhall behold, glorifie God in the day of viſitation*, 1 Pet. 2. 12. Phil. 1. 11. Joh. 15. 8. Glorifie God, I ſay, whoſe workmanſhip you are, *created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works*, which God hath before ordained, that ye ſhould walk in them, *Epheſ.* 2. 10. that ſo, *having your fruit unto holineſs, you may have the end*, or conſequent, not the merit of your works, *viz. eternal life*, Rom. 6. 22.

2. As, when you have done all, you are but an unprofitable ſervant, and therefore muſt not preſume to come to God in the opinion of your own worthineſs, *yet be not afraid to come to God becauſe of your unworthineſs.* The *worſt* of men ſhould not keep off from God becauſe they are *unprofitable*, ſince the *beſt* cannot *profit* him. If we have done *much*, it is *nothing* to the Lord; and if we have done *nothing*, it is *no bar* to the Lord his doing *much* for us. God will not turn us back becauſe we bring him nothing; nay, he invites us to come without any thing, *Iſai.* 55. 1. *without money*, or money-worth.

3. When you have done all, and are moſt fully laden with good works, *beg earneſtly of God to work and keep in you low and humble thoughts of your ſelf, of all you do or ſuffer for him.* They, of whom God hath the *higheſt* thoughts, have the *meaneſt* thoughts of, and put the loweſt rate upon themſelves. No man ever received a fairer *Certificate* from God than *Job* did, *Job* 1. 1, 8. *None like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man*; and yet no man could think or ſpeak more *humbly*, and undervaluingly of himſelf than *Job* did, *Job* 42. 6. *He abhors himſelf, and repents in duſt and aſhes:* And *Job* 9. 15. Whom though I were righteous, *yet would I not anſwer*, but I would make ſupplication to my Judge. And *Verſ.* 20, 21. Though I were perfect, *yet would I not know my ſoul*, I would deſpiſe my life.

To

To make and keep thee *humble* under thy greateſt *attainments*: *Uſe* 3. *Direction.*

1. *Often look up and conſider the infinite purity and holineſs of God*: the more we *know* God, the more *humble* we are before him. *Job* 42. 5, 6. *Now mine eye hath ſeen thee*, i. having now a clearer and more glorious manifeſtation of thee to my ſoul than ever: I now perceiving thy pure Holineſs, Wiſdom, Faithfulneſs, Goodneſs, as if they were corporeal Objects, and I ſaw them with mine eye; on this very ſcore *abhorring my ſelf in duſt and aſhes.*

2. When thou haſt done all, *Remember ſtill, that thy ability to do good works is not at all from thy ſelf, but from the Spirit of Chriſt*, Joh. 15. 4, 5. 2 Cor. 3. 5. Ezek. 36. 26, 27. A continual *gale and influence* of the holy *Spirit* neceſſary to bring thy richly-laden Soul into its *Port*, *Phil.* 2. 13. and 4. 13.

3. When thou art at thy *Non ultra*, in thy very *Zenith* of attainable Excellencies here; *Remember that all thy acceptation at the hand of God, both as to perſon and performance, depends wholly and ſolely on the bleſſed Jeſus, and thy peculiar intereſt in him*, Epheſ. 1. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 5. Exod. 8. 28. Gen. 4. 4. Heb. 11. 4. and 13. 20, 21. 2 Cor. 8. 12. Heb. 6. 10. Mat. 25. 21, 23.

SERMON XVII.

The Popiſh Doctrine, which forbiddeth to Marry, is a Deviliſh and Wicked Doctrine.

1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, and part of the 3 Verſe, *Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that in the latter times ſome ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and doctrines of devils, ſpeaking lyes in hypocriſie, having their conſciences ſeared with a hot iron,* Forbidding to Marry.

THe Church of *Rome* hath been in her day as famous and truly worthy of Renown, as any Church which we read of, either in Scripture or Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: I mean in the Primitive days of Chriſtianity, whilſt ſhe retained her Primitive Faith and Purity. Her Fame was great and growing, even whilſt the Apoſtle *Paul* was alive, who writing unto her, giveth thanks unto God for her, *That her Faith was ſpoken of thorowout the whole World*, Rom. 1. 8. This Church had the advantage of being ſeated in the Miſtreſs-City of the Earth, where the Court then was of the chief Empire; unto which reſort being made from all parts of the World, the moſt of which at that time were ſubject and Tributary unto *Rome*; her Faith and Obedience unto the Goſpel of Chriſt ſo openly profeſſed, ſo generally known and taken notice of at home, was ſpread abroad, and carried far and near by ſtrangers in their return from *Rome* into their own Countries. Then the Church of *Rome* was truly Apoſtolical, *being built upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apoſtles, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief corner ſtone*, Epheſ. 2. 20. And ſo long as ſhe kept this Foundation, her building was of Silver, Gold, precious Stones; ſo long ſhe did ſhine with true Luſtre and Glory. But in proceſs of time this ſo famous a Church did decline, and by degrees degenerate, ſo that at length ſhe became an infamous Apoſtatical Church, and the ſeat of

of Antichriſt himſelf, the greateſt Enemy, next the Devil, which Chriſt hath in the World. When ſhe left her Foundation, her glorious Building of purer Metals and precious Stones, was changed into infirm and courſe Building of Wood, Hay and Stubble, which is under the curſe, and whoſe end is to be conſumed with Fire: Then her Golden Head fell off, and was ſtrangely metamorphoſed into Feet of Iron and Clay, which the Stone hewen out of the Mountain without hands will daſh to pieces.

This Defection and Apoſtacy of the Church of *Rome*, was foreſeen, and foretold by the Apoſtle *Paul* in this Epiſtle to *Timothy*, as alſo moſt plainly in his ſecond Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*. In the Text he that runneth may read a true Deſcription of the Apoſtate Church of *Rome*: *Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that in the latter times ſome ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing Spirits, and Doctrines of Devils, ſpeaking lyes in hypocriſie, having their Conſciences ſeared with a hot Iron, forbidding to marry*, &c.

The Church of *Rome* doth aſſume to her ſelf to be *The Houſe of God, the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, ſpoken of Verſ. 15. of the former Chapter. If it ſhould be granted that ſhe was ſo at the firſt, and when the Apoſtle did write this Epiſtle, although he ſpake not of her in particular then, but of the Chriſtian Church in the general, of which ſhe was a part; methinks ſince her Corruption and Apoſtalie, ſince her great Degeneration into Antichriſtianiſm, ſhe might apply unto her ſelf (ſure I am that others do with firm reaſon) what is aſſerted and foretold in the Text, which in every particular is very applicable unto her. *Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly.* By the Spirit, we are to underſtand the Spirit of God, who ſpeaketh expreſly by the mouth of this Apoſtle, a man full of the Holy Ghoſt, whereby he was infallibly guided in what he here writeth and foretelleth. Or the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that is, in ſome other place of Divine Writ, ſaith Learned Mr. *Joſeph Mede* upon the place: and he inſtanceth in *Dan.* 11. 36,37,38,39. which he interpreteth and accommodateth to this Scripture, *That in the latter times*; The latter times is ſometimes taken for the laſt Age of the World, which includeth all the times of the Goſpel; but I rather think by the latter times we are to underſtand the latter Age of the Chriſtian Church, which muſt be removed ſome conſiderable time from the times of the Apoſtle, and ſo is ſuitable to the Apoſtaſie of the Roman Church. *Some* ſhall depart, &c. Hereby, ſaith Mr. *Mede*, we are not to underſtand a ſmall number, but only the exception of ſome particulars: thus *ſome* is of the ſame import with *many* in Scripture uſage, *Joh.* 6. 60, 66, compared with 64. *Rom.* 11. 17. 1 *Cor.* 10. 7, 8, 9, 10. Some *ſhall depart from the Faith*, that is, they ſhall depart from the Doctrine of Faith, and thus the Papiſts do moſt groſly, as in many other, ſo particularly in their Doctrine of Juſtification by works, ſo corrupt, and contrary unto the Doctrine which this ſame Apoſtle

taught in his Epistle to the *Romans*. Or some shall depart from the Faith, that is, saith *Mede*, they shall break their Oath of Fidelity unto Christ, that in and through him alone they should approach and worship the Divine Majesty; and he interpreteth this Apostasie to signifie no other than Idolatry, according to the ordinary acceptation of the word in the Scripture, which the Church of *Rome* above all Churches is guilty of. *Giving heed to seducing Spirits, and Doctrines of Devils.* By seducing Spirits, saith *Calvin*, is meant false Prophets and Doctors, who boast of the Spirit of God, but are acted by Satan, who is a lying Spirit in their mouth, as 1 *King.* 22. 22. By Doctrines of Devils, saith the same Author, is meant the Deviliſh Doctrines of these Helliſhly inspired false Prophets. *Prophetas aut Doctores intelligit, quos ideo sic nominat quia Spiritum jactant. Satan aliquando Spiritus est mendax in ore pseudo-Prophetarium, (Doctrinis Dæmoniorum) quod perinde est ac si dixisset, attendentes pseudo-Prophetis & Diabolicis eorum dogmatibus.* Calv. in locum. Thus the Papists are under strong delusions, in their giving heed unto, and belief of those Lyes, and false Doctrines at first forged by the Devils in Hell, and vented afterward by the Mouths and Pens of of their Ministers upon Earth. Mr. *Mede* interpreteth the διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, to be Doctrines not of Devils, which they are the Authors of, but of *Dæmons*, as the word signifieth, or concerning *Dæmons*, as the inferiour Deified Powers were called by the Gentiles, whom they thought a middle sort of Divine Powers between the Sovereign and Heavenly gods, and mortal men; whose office was to be Agents and Mediators between the Heavenly gods and men, whose original was the Deified Souls of worthy men after death, and some of a higher degree that never were imprisoned in Bodies, unto whom they consecrated Images, Pillars and Temples, adoring them there and their Reliques: And he telleth us, that the Doctrine of *Dæmons* comprehends in most expres manner the whole Idolatry of the Mystery of Iniquity, the Deifying and Invocating of Saints and Angels, (those middle Powers between God and mortal men) the bowing to Images, the worshipping of Crosses as new Idol-Columns, the adoring and templing of Reliques, the worshipping of any other visible thing upon supposal of any Divinity therein; what Copy, saith he, was ever so like the example, as all this to the Doctrine of *Dæmons*? And is not this now fulfilled which was foretold, *Rev.* 11. That *the second and outmost Court of the Temple*, (which is the second state of the Christian Church) *together with the Holy City, should be trodden down, and over-trampled by the Gentiles* (that is, overwhelmed with the Gentiles Idolatry) *forty and two months?* The Parallel may be read at large in that ingenuous piece of Mr. *Mede*'s, called, *The Apostacy of the latter times*, upon this Text in *Timothy*; and I am very prone to think that he hath more fully expressed and explained the mind of the Holy Ghost in this place, than any that went before him.

The

The ſecond and third Verſes of this Chapter, do ſet forth the quality of the *perſons*, and the means whereby this defection ſhould enter, *ſpeaking lyes in hypocriſie*, or through the hypocriſie of Lyars, this the ſame Author applyeth to the Popiſh Doctrines, which hath obtained, 1. By Lyes of Miracles; 2. Fabulous Legends of the Acts of Saints, and ſufferings of Martyrs; 3. Counterfeit Writings under the name of the firſt and beſt Antiquity. *Having their Conſciences ſeared with a hot Iron.* And who, ſaith Mr. *Mede*, could have coined, or who could have believed ſuch monſtrous ſtuff as the Popiſh Legends are ſtuffed with, but ſuch as were cauterized, paſt all feeling and tenderneſs both of Conſcience and ſenſe it ſelf? *Forbidding to marry.* The applicableneſs of this to the Papiſts will appear in what I have now to ſay, and my Diſcourſe muſt be confined to the latter clauſe of the Text, *Forbidding to marry.* From which the Queſtion which I am to ſpeak unto is this, *Whether the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry be a deviliſh and wicked Doctrine?* This I affirm, and this, through God's help, I ſhall prove, and that my proceeding herein may be the more clear, I ſhall, 1. Show how far the Popiſh Doctrine doth forbid to marry: 2. Prove that their Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: 3. Anſwer the Arguments which are brought for this Doctrine: Fourthly and laſtly, I ſhall ſhut up my Diſcourſe with ſome Uſes.

1. How far the Popiſh Doctrine forbiddeth to marry.

Firſt Negatively, this Doctrine doth not forbid all Marriage; and yet this I may truly ſay, that Popiſh Writers ſpeak ſo diſgracefully and contemptuouſly of Marriage in their Argumentations againſt the Marriage of ſome, that if all were true which they affirm, it would be unlawful for any as they hope for Salvation to link themſelves in the bonds of Matrimony.

Secondly and Poſitively, the Popiſh Doctrine forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, particularly of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, and of all that enter into Holy Orders: and not only of all thoſe men who are employed in the ſervice of the Church and Miniſtry, but alſo of all thoſe Women and Virgins who have vowed Continency, and have entred themſelves into Nunneries. Beſides what is generally aſſerted by the Popiſh Doctors who write of this point, the Canon of the Council of *Trent*, which the Papiſts univerſally do ſubſcribe unto, and own for infallible truth, is plainly this: *Ex octava Seſſione Trid. Con. Can. 9. Si quis dixerit, Clericos in ſacris Ordinibus conſtitutos, vel Regulares Caſtitatem ſolenniter profeſſos, poſſe Matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum eſſe, non obſtante lege Eccleſiaſtica vel voto, & oppoſitum nil aliud eſſe quam damnare Matrimonium, poſſeque omnes contrahere Matrimonium, qui non ſentiunt ſe caſtitatis (etiamſi eam voverint) habere Donum, Anathema ſit; cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos ſupra id quod poſſumus tentari.* "If any ſay, that the Clergy, who have

"received

" received holy Orders, or Regulars who have solemnly professed Chastity, may contract Marriage, and that such contract (notwithstanding the Ecclesiastical Law and their own Vow) is valid; and that the contrary Assertion is no other than to condemn Marriage; and that all (although they have vowed Chastity) may contract Marriage that do not find they have the gift of Chastity. Let him be accursed; for as much as God will not deny this gift unto those who rightly seek it, neither will he suffer us to be tempted above what we are able.

The Popish Ecclesiastical Laws admit none into sacred Orders before they solemnly vow Chastity, or (as they interpret it) abstaining from Marriage: And it is required of Nuns that they solemnly vow to preserve and persevere unto death in their Virginity, or single estate, without any regard unto any unforeseen necessity for Marriage; and amongst all the Dispensations that are granted by the Pope, amongst all the Indulgencies which he makes sale of, to allow grosly moral evils, absolutely forbidden by the Lord, no Dispensations or Indulgencies are granted by him for the Marriage of such as are under this Celibate Vow, although they are not able to contain, and although God doth command such to marry. I shall do the Papists no wrong in saying that they account it a greater crime for Ecclesiastical Persons to marry, than for them to commit Fornication or Sodomy. The learned *Chamier* doth give several instances of Popish Writers to this purpose, *viz. Hosius*, who *doth defend the saying of* Pighius *as not only true, but pious, that a Priest through the infirmity of the flesh falling into the sin of Fornication, doth sin less than if he should marry; and telleth us, that although this Assertion seem foul, yet the Catholicks account it most honest. Reprehenditur Pighius qui non vere magis, quam pie, scriptum reliquit, minus peccare Sacerdotem, qui ex infirmitate carnis in Fornicationem sit prolapsus, quam qui nuptias contraxit, Turpis videtur hæc oratio, contra, Catholicis honestissimum.* Hosius Confessionis capite 56. *Costerus*, who *doth assert that a Priest who doth fornicate or nourish a Concubine at home in his house, although he be guilty of great Sacriledge, yet he doth more heinously offend if he contract Matrimony. Sacerdos si fornicetur, aut domi Concubinam foveat, tametsi gravi Sacrilegio se obstringat; Gravius tamen peccat, si contrahat Matrimonium.* Costerus de Lætib. Sacerd. Cardinal *Campegio*, who *doth aver, that for Priests to become Husbands, is by far a more heinous crime than if they should keep many Whores in their houses. Quod Sacerdotes fiant mariti multo esse gravius peccatum, quam si plurimas domi meretrices alant.* Cardin. Campeg. apud Sleidan. Commentar. Libro Quarto. *Matthias Aquensis*, who *doth profess his opinion, that such who marry after their Vow of Continency, do offend more than such a one as through Humane frailty doth deviate*, (as he terms it) which in plain English is, who through the power of burning lust is unclean *with a hundred divers persons. Qui post continentiæ votum, devovet potestatem corporis cuivis mulieri magis offendit, quam iste qui humana fragilitate deviavit*

vices cum centum diverſis perſonis. Matthias Aquenſis. Our *Molinæus* telleth us, *that by the Rules of the Roman Church, a Sodomiſt may exerciſe the Prieſthood, and by that abominable vice doth not run into irregularity; whereas Marriage is judged altogether incompatible with ſacred Orders:* and he quotes *Navarrus*, ſaying, *The crime of Sodomy is not comprehended amongſt the crimes that bring irregularity*, and giveth ſeveral reaſons for it. *Molin. Novelty of Popery, Book 7. Chap.* 5. And no wonder, when *John Caſa* Archbiſhop of *Benevent*, and Dean of the Apoſtolical Chamber, printed a Book at *Venice* in defence of Sodomy. *Sleidan* ſaith that he *wrote a Sodomitical Book, than which nothing more foul could have been thought upon by man; neither did he bluſh to celebrate with praiſes that moſt filthy ſin, too much known in* Italy *and* Greece. *Ille quem diximus, Archiepiſcopus Beneventanus, libellum conſcripſit plane Cinædum, & quo nihil fœdius excogitari poſſit; nec enim puduit eum, ſcelus omnium longe turpiſſimum, ſed per Italiam nimis notum, atque Græciam, celebrare laudibus.* Sleidan. Com. Lib. 11. p. 652. This was that *Caſa* by whom *Francis Spira* was ſeduced to revolt from his Profeſſion, the cauſe of ſuch hideous terrours of Conſcience afterward, and ſo miſerable an end. It is evident then that the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celebate Vow, is forbidden by the Popiſh Doctrine.

2. The ſecond thing is, to prove that the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine; and this I ſhall do by ſeveral Arguments.

Arg. 1. That Doctrine which is a falſe Doctrine, and contrary unto the Word of God, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a falſe Doctrine, and contrary unto the Word of God: Therefore it is deviliſh and wicked.

All ſuch Doctrine as is falſe, is deviliſh, the Devil being the Father of Lyes, eſpecially of lying falſe Doctrine, whereby he doth blind the eyes of them which believe not, and corrupt the minds of them who are his Children and followers; likewiſe that Doctrine which is contrary unto the Word of God, is of the Devil, who is the greateſt Enemy which the Word of God hath, becauſe of the great miſchief which the Word of God hath done to his Cauſe, and the Intereſt of his Kingdom. And be ſure that all ſuch Doctrine as is deviliſh, is wicked; the Devil being ſuch a foul and wicked Spirit, as is wholly void and empty of all moral good, and from whom nothing but wickedneſs doth proceed.

If there be any queſtion, it will be of the minor Propoſition, which is this, That the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a falſe Doctrine, and contrary unto the Word of God. I need no other proof that it is falſe, than that it is contrary unto the Word of God; this Word proceeding

from

from the Fountain of Light and Truth, I mean, from God who is all Light, and with whom dwelleth no Darkness at all, who is Truth it self, and with whom it is impossible any lye or mistake should be found. The chief thing then that is to be proved is this, That this Popish Doctrine is contrary unto the Word of God. And this will appear in that, 1. This Doctrine forbiddeth that which the Word of God alloweth: 2. This Doctrine forbiddeth that which the Word of God in some case commandeth.

1. The Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, forbiddeth that which the Word of God alloweth. And this is evident in that,

1. The Word of God alloweth Marriage, and maketh no exception of the Clergy, or any under the Celibate Vow. That which God did at first institute and appoint, surely the Word of God doth allow: Marriage being God's Ordinance, none will deny that it hath God's allowance; and that the Word of God maketh no exception of the Clergy, or any under the Celibate Vow, is plain, because the Popish Writers can bring no Scripture in the whole Bible which maketh such exception; no Scripture that doth this directly, is urged by any of them: what firm Scripture-consequence they may plead, will be seen when we come to speak to their Arguments for this Doctrine. In the mean time it may be evident unto all, that the Scripture alloweth the Marriage of all, without such exceptions as the Papists make, by one clear Scripture which admitteth of no contradiction by any other, *Heb.* 13. 4. *Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but Whoremongers and Adulterers God will judge.* All that are unclean without Marriage, such as Whoremongers; all that defile the Marriage-bed, such as Adulterers, are guilty of a shameful and great God-provoking sin, for which God will judge them, (if they before do not make their peace with him, and forsake such wicked practices) and punish them everlastingly in Hell: But Marriage is honourable, and therefore lawful; and that not only in some, but in all without any exception.

2. The Word of God is so far from excepting the Marriage of the Clergy, that it doth plainly allow the Marriage of such persons.

1. In the Old Testament-times the Prophets, Priests, Levites, and all those which attended more immediately the service of God, and at the Altar under the Law, were allowed to marry. *Abraham*, who was a Prophet and Priest in his own house, did not take *Sarah* to be his Wife without God's allowance, otherwise surely God would not have so signally owned his Marriage, as to make promise of the blessed Seed unto him hereby. *Rebecca* was a Wife of God's chusing for *Isaac*. God never blamed *Moses*, that great Prophet, for marrying *Zipporah*; neither was *Aaron* faulty because he had his Wife and Children. *Isaiah*, that Evangelical Prophet, was married, and had Children too in the time of his Prophecy, which the Scripture in the recording of it doth

not

not impute to him for any iniquity. The Prieſts and Levites generally did marry; and however ſome of them are reproved in Scripture for divers ſins, yet Matrimony is never in the leaſt charged upon them for any crime. If then ſuch, whoſe office and employment under the Law was to adminiſter about holy things, did marry, and might do it without any ſin againſt God: by parity of reaſon, Miniſters and all thoſe of the Clergy, who adminiſter about holy things in the times of the Goſpel, have allowance and liberty without any offence to God to make uſe of Marriage. The reply of the Papiſts is frivolous, and ſcarce worth mentioning: the chief thing that they reply unto, is concerning the Marriage of the Prieſts and Levites, who, they ſay, had their courſes to attend the ſervice of the Temple and Altar, and that then they were to ſeparate from their Wives, which was at that time as if they had none: whereas the Clergy now are to attend the ſervice of God in their work continually, and therefore ought to abſtain from Marriage altogether. But beſides that they can never prove that the Prieſts and Levites did ſeparate from their Wives in the time of their courſes; what will they ſay unto the Marriage of thoſe Prieſts and Levites, who continually and daily did adminiſter at the Altar before the diviſion of them into courſes, namely, before the time of *David?*

2. In the New Teſtament times Miniſters have a plain and expreſs allowance to marry, as will appear by two or three places of Scripture.

The firſt Scripture which doth allow the Marriage of Miniſters, is 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. *Have we not power to lead about a Siſter, a Wife, as well as other Apoſtles, and as the Brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?* The words are written by the Apoſtle *Paul*; who himſelf was an unmarried man, as he telleth the *Corinthians* in the ſeventh Chapter of this Epiſtle; yet in this Chapter and Verſe he doth aſſert his power which he lawfully might have taken to lead about a Siſter, a Wife, which in another phraſe is the ſame as if he had ſaid, to marry: And he giveth inſtance in the uſe which others of his Function had made of their power, not only other Miniſters, but other Apoſtles, yea and the chiefeſt of the Apoſtles, the Brethren of the Lord, and *Cephas*, that is, *Peter* himſelf, of whoſe Wife and Marriage the Scripture doth take notice of in more than one place. If then ſome of the Apoſtles did marry, and the other Apoſtles had power to do the like, then any Miniſters of the Goſpel have the ſame power and allowance to marry: this conſequence is plain and undeniable, becauſe the Apoſtles were Miniſters of the Goſpel; and what was lawful for them as Miniſters, is lawful for any other Miniſters; and it is as plain in this Scripture that ſome of the Apoſtles did marry, and that others had power to do the like. The great exception of the Papiſts againſt this Scripture, is, that this word tranſlated Wife is γυναῖκα, which they ſay ſignifieth a Woman, and therefore that the leading about a Woman doth not imply Marriage: and they interpret the meaning of this

place, that the Apostles had power to lead about Women to be helpers to them, as our Saviour had Women following of him, who did minister unto him. But besides that the ordinary signification of this word is Wife, it may be evident to an unprejudiced mind, that it must signifie Wife, and nothing else in this place, because of the word Sister used before it, of which the word γυναῖκα is exegetical, or explainatory: for all truly believing Women being Sisters, that the Apostle might be understood what kind of Sister he speaketh of, he addeth γυναῖκα, which cannot be interpreted with good sense *Woman*, unless there had been Sisters who were Men and not Women. How could the Sister whom the Apostle had power to lead about, be distinguished from other Sisters whom he did not lead about? were they not Women as well as she? Therefore the signification must needs be Wife, and hereby the Sister he had power to lead about is distinguished from all other Sisters whom he did not marry. If any should further reply, that supposing the word γυναῖκα to signifie Wife, the Apostle might speak not of taking a Wife himself, but of leading about the Wife of another to be his helper. I answer, That the Apostle speaketh of something wherein he had power, and which he did not make use of, and this in reference unto Women was Marriage: but as to other Women, he did lead some about, and they were helpers unto him; as for instance, *Priscilla*, who with her Husband *Aquila* sailed with *Paul* into *Syria*, *Act.* 18. 18. and he calleth them *his helpers in Christ*, Rom. 16. 3. and in the second Verse of the same Chapter he commendeth *Phebe* to the *Romans*, because she had been *the succourer of many, and of himself also*; and Verse 6. he greeteth *Mary, who had bestowed much labour on him.* The Apostle then frequently making use of the help of other Women, and here speaking of the power which he had to lead about a Sister, a Wife, which he did not make use of, it must be needs understood of his leading about a Wife of his own, or of his Marriage, when the Apostle saith, *Have we not power to lead about a Sister, a Wife?* Two things are implyed: 1. That he did not lead about a Sister, a Wife; that is, that he did not marry, for he had Sisters to be his helpers as hath been shewn. 2. That he had power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, or that it was lawful for him to marry; this Interrogative implying a strong Affirmative; and this power which he had he proveth by the Marriage of other Apostles, and expressly of *Peter:* for if the great Apostle of the *Jews*, which was *Peter*, was married; then the great Apostle of the *Gentiles*, which was *Paul*, might marry too: and if the Apostles themselves, the most eminent Ministers, might marry; then it is lawful for any other Ministers to do it, who are their Successors in the Ministerial work.

Another Scripture which giveth allowance to the Marriage of Ministers, is *Tit.* 1. 6. *If any be blameless, the Husband of one Wife, having faithful Children, not accused of riot or unruly.* The Apostle is here speaking of the Elders or Ministers which were to be ordained in every

City,

City, as in the former Verſe; and in this Verſe he ſheweth how ſuch as are Miniſters ſhould be qualified, *If any be blameleſs, the Husband of one Wife, having faithful Children:* here the Qualification of *blameleſs* is uſed in Conjunction with *the Husband of a Wife*, and the *Father of Children*, in the perſon of a Miniſter. It is evident then that a married Miniſter may be blameleſs; and one that is a Spiritual Father, may be a Natural Father too without any offence unto God. Indeed if a Miniſter ſhould have had at that time two Wives together, as the cuſtom of the Jews was of old, this would have been offenſive unto God; but to be the Husband of one Wife then, was, and ſtill is inoffenſive in Miniſters.

The third Scripture is like unto this, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. *A Biſhop muſt be blameleſs, the Husband of one Wife*, &c. Verſ. 4, 5. *One that ruleth well his own Houſe, having his Children in ſubjection with all gravity: (For if a man know not how to rule his own Houſe, how ſhall he take care of the Church of God?)* Verſ. 11. *Even ſo muſt their Wives be grave, not ſlanderers, ſober, faithful in all things.* Verſ. 12. *Let the Deacons be Husbands of one Wife, ruling their Children and their own Houſes well.* It was not without ſpecial Providence that Miniſters ſhould have this Qualification affixed once and again unto them in their Function, that they muſt be *Husbands of one Wife*; which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if they muſt of neceſſity be Husbands, or elſe they muſt not be Miniſters; but that if they be Husbands it muſt be but of one Wife at one time: ſo that though the Scripture doth not command all of them to marry, yet it doth not forbid any, but alloweth every Miniſter to marry, ſo that he taketh not many, or more than one Wife at a time. The Papiſts are forced to wink hard to keep out the light of theſe places, and they are greatly put to it to find out ſhifts for the evading the plain and clear truth, that Miniſters have allowance by theſe Scriptures to marry. Some of them expound the meaning of the words, *The Husband of one Wife*, to ſignifie the Paſtoral charge of one Church, unto which a Miniſter hath relation as a Husband to his Wife: but this cannot be the meaning, becauſe the Apoſtle doth here diſtinguiſh between the Houſe of the Miniſter where he is the Husband of one Wife, from the Church of God; and the Children of the Miniſter by this one Wife which he is to rule over, cannot be underſtood of Spiritual Children, but of Natural Children, as is plain in the fourth and fifth Verſes; *One that ruleth well his own Houſe, having his Children in ſubjection with all gravity: (For if a man know not how to rule his own Houſe, how ſhall he take care of the Church of God?)* Others interpret the words, *The Husband of one Wife*, to be meant of what the Miniſter to be choſen was before he entereth into this ſacred Function, not that he hath liberty for one Wife after he engageth in the Miniſtry; and therefore the Papiſts, if they admit any married perſons to this high Function, they force them to abandon their Wives. But this cannot be the meaning of the Apoſtle,

because he speaketh not of such who have been the Husbands of one Wife, but of those that are so: and as they must be blameless, vigilant, sober, and retain the other Qualifications there required after they are Ministers; so they may retain their Wives too, there being not the least hint given in this Scripture, or any else, that Ministers must put away their Wives when they become Ministers. Amongst the causes of Divorce in the Scripture, this be sure is none; and when God hath joined Ministers and their Wives together, what Humane power may lawfully put them asunder? Yea, on the contrary the Apostle supposeth in this place that Ministers should live with their Wives, by his Directions, 1. In general, in reference to their own Houses, of which the Wife as well as the Children are a part, whom he would have to rule well. 2. In particular, in reference to their Wives, whose Qualifications he sets down, that they should be *grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things*, that they might be the more meet helpers of their Husbands in their Work, and the better Examples to the Flock; and sure then this doth imply that Ministers may, yea ought to live with their Wives after they become Ministers. Thus the Popish Doctrine forbiddeth that which the Word of God doth allow.

2. The Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and all under the Celibate Vow, forbiddeth that which the Word of God in some cases doth command. And the case is this: When single or unmarried persons, although they apprehend that they might bring most Glory unto God in their single estate, upon supposition that they had the gift of Continency; yet really do find themselves to be without this gift, after they have earnestly prayed unto God for it, after fasting, self-denial, watchfulness, and diligent use of all means to keep under their body, and notwithstanding all this they do feel in themselves such burning lusts as do defile their minds, disturb them in the service of God, and endanger their commission of the sin of fornication as they have opportunity for it, and meet with any temptation unto it; in such a case it is the express command of God that such persons should marry for the quenching of those burning lusts, and the preventing of that filthy and abominable sin of fornication. This is plain, 1 *Cor.* 7. 1, 2. *It is good for a man not to touch a woman: Nevertheless to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.* If the man be in danger of fornication, let him have his own wife; if the woman be in danger, let her have her own husband; and when is it that they are in danger? it is when they cannot contain, this supposeth the use of means, otherwise the word would not have been *cannot contain*, Vers. 8, 9. *I say therefore unto the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I: But if they cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn.* Now this may be, and too too often is the case of some of the Clergy, and others under the Celibate Vow; all which persons, without the exception of this

this caſe, the Popiſh Doctrine doth forbid to marry; therefore the Popiſh Doctrine is contrary unto the Word of God, in forbidding that which the Word of God commandeth. I know the Canon of the Council of *Trent*, to evade the force of this Scripture, doth aſſert, *That God will not deny this gift of Continency unto thoſe who rightly ſeek it; neither will he ſuffer us to be tempted above what we are able.* Unto which I anſwer, That God will not deny any gift which he hath promiſed unto thoſe that rightly ſeek it: But the Papiſts will never prove, while their eyes are open, that God hath abſolutely promiſed the gift of Continency unto all thoſe that diligently and moſt rightly ſeek it. Whatever gifts are neceſſary unto Salvation, God hath abſolutely promiſed unto thoſe that rightly ſeek them: But this gift of Continency in a ſingle eſtate is not numbred by the Scripture, and therefore ought not to be ſo by any amongſt thoſe gifts: for if ſo, then none could be ſaved that are without it; and hence it would follow, that all who are married ſhould certainly be damned, which the Papiſts themſelves will not affirm. This gift of Continency God doth beſtow upon ſome of his Children, but not upon all his Children: when the Diſciples ſay unto our Saviour, *Matth.* 19. 10. *If the caſe of the man be ſo with his wife, it is not good to marry*; our Saviour anſwereth, Verſ. 11. *All men cannot receive this ſaying, ſave they unto whom it is given.* And the Apoſtle ſpeaking of this gift, telleth us, 1 *Cor.* 7. 7. *I would that all men were even as I my ſelf*, (that is, unmarried) *but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.* By *all men*, which our Saviour ſpeaketh of, and *every man*, which the Apoſtle *Paul* ſpeaketh of, we are to underſtand not all and every one of the Children of the World, but all and every one of the Children of God, all thoſe cannot receive the ſaying to be without Marriage. When God in Converſion doth work a change in their Souls, he doth not alter the Conſtitution of their Bodies, and there are ſome both Men and Women, although truly religious, yet are of ſuch Conſtitution of Body that they cannot contain without Marriage, they cannot receive the ſaying to be without marrying, and withal without burning. Some of God's Children have a proper gift of God to live chaſtly in a ſingle eſtate, and others have a proper gift of God to live chaſtly only in a married eſtate. If then the gift of Continency be not a gift which God hath in common promiſed unto all his Children that rightly ſeek it, as it is plain that it is not, then the Council of *Trent* doth aſſert a falſhood, That God will not deny this gift unto all that rightly ſeek it, if they mean by rightly ſeeking, diligently ſeeking, for God often-time doth deny it unto ſuch ſeekers: if they mean by rightly ſeeking, ſeeking in faith, I deny that any can ſeek this gift in faith abſolutely, becauſe there is no abſolute promiſe of it; and ſo it is true, that God will not deny this gift to thoſe that rightly ſeek it; and it is falſe, that any can ſeek it rightly, that is, in faith, abſolutely.

What

What the Council doth further assert, *That God will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able*, is true, because it is the expres Word of God: but it is not rightly applyed here. God will not suffer his Children to be tempted above what they are able, by affliction; neither will he suffer them to be tempted above what they are able unto sin, no not to the sin of fornication; but then it must be understood upon supposition that they make use of all lawful means for the prevention of this sin, and one both lawful and commanded means is Marriage, without which some of them may be tempted above what they are able unto it, so as to be overtaken by it, and live in the practice of it.

I have done with the first Argument, which being the chiefest and most comprehensive, I have been the largest in the handling of; I shall be more brief in the rest.

Arg. 2. That Doctrine which under the shew of Piety doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, under the shew of Piety doth lead unto much lewdness and villany: Therefore this Doctrine is a deviliſh and wicked Doctrine.

Whatever it be that leadeth unto much lewdness and villany, is deviliſh and wicked, 1 *John* 3. 8. *He that committeth sin is of the Devil*, he is lead to it by the Devil: he is of the Devil, that is, he is a servant of the Devil, or a Child of the Devil, *Joh.* 8. 44. *Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.* But when any are lead unto much lewdness and villany under the shew of piety, they are lead by the Devil hereunto more especially; therefore that Doctrine which under the shew of piety doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, must needs be a deviliſh wicked Doctrine. That such is the Popish Doctrine, is evident.

1. The Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, hath a shew in it of piety; the pretence of such prohibition is, that these persons forbidden to marry might be the more mortified, chaste and holy, that they might be the more free from worldly cares, and more at liberty to addict themselves unto the service of the Lord without distraction. Here is a fair shew of piety, not in an ordinary, but in an eminent degree.

2. This Popish Doctrine doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, namely, unto Fornication, Adultery, Incest, Sodomy, Murder, and the like lewd practices, which have been the product of this prohibition to marry. But because I would not have this Argument swell bigger than the former, I shall reserve the proof of this to the Use of Information concerning the deviliſh wickedness of the Popish Church.

Object. If it be said, That there are and have been many of the Popish Clergy eminent for their Chastity. That the uncleannesses of some

cannot

cannot be charged upon the generality. That whatever lewdneſs any of them have been guilty of, it is not the proper effect of this prohibition, but proceedeth from the wickedneſs of mans heart. I anſwer.

Anſw. 1. Some may be eminent for Chaſtity in the eſteem of men, that ſecretly are guilty of the baſeſt filthineſs in the ſight of God; and ſuch of them as really do abſtain from groſſer pollutions, ſome may thank their Conſtitution more than their Vow that they are reſtrained. But if it ſhould be granted, that ſome few of them do deny themſelves, and keep under their bodies that they may poſſeſs their veſſels in ſanctification; yet this doth not invalidate the Argument drawn from the woful effect which this prohibition to marry hath upon ſo many others.

2. If we cannot charge the generality of the Popiſh Clergy with the groſſer ſins of Adultery, Fornication, Sodomy, and the like; yet why may we not without breach of Charity imagine that their own Conſciences will charge them ſufficiently herewith, 1. When the moſt of ſuch ſins which are committed by them are done in ſecret. 2. When ſo many of thoſe ſins are come to light, and their own Hiſtorians do accuſe them thereof. 3. When ſo many of their Popes themſelves, their Fathers and Examples, have been guilty ſo groſly. 4. When Indulgencies for Stews, for Sodomy, for Prieſts keeping Concubines, have been ſo generally granted. 5. When their Principles do encourage unto ſuch ſins. All which I ſhall make evident in the Uſe.

3. It is true, that the lewdneſs of the Popiſh Clergy doth primarily proceed from the wickedneſs of their own hearts; and it is as true, that their prohibition to marry doth lead unto this lewdneſs. If a River have but two Chanels to run in, he that dammeth up and ſtoppeth the courſe of the River in one of theſe Chanels, may be ſaid to lead the River into the other Chanel: Even ſo, when the Conſtitution of ſome mens bodies is ſuch, that their burning deſires will have their courſe and vent, and cannot be quenched except by Matrimony or by Adultery, either by their own Wives, or by ſtrange Women; ſuch as prohibit Marriage, and cut off the uſe of the only remedy in ſome perſons againſt Adultery or Fornication, they do lead hereby unto the practice of theſe abominable ſins, and others as abominable, which are the attendants or conſequents of them.

Arg. 3. That Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of any, that hereby they may merit the Kingdom of Heaven, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, forbiddeth the Marriage of ſuch, that hereby they may merit the Kingdom of Heaven. This will appear by what *Chemnitius* doth aſſert and prove out of their own Writings: *Pontificii quando de cauſa finali Virginitatis, ſeu cælibatus diſputant, quo conſilio, quo fine & propter quam cauſam ſuſcipiendus vel ſervandus*

servandus est cælibatus, palam docent, Ideo suscipiendum & servandum esse cælibatum quia sit satisfactio pro peccatis, & meritum salutis & vitæ æternæ. Albertus Pighius in Controversia 14. *de votis Monasticis exertis verbis dicit. Illa eligimus ea opinione & confidentia, quia existimamus illis Dei gratiam & benevolentiam promereri. Item Monastice assumitur a profitentibus quia creditur valere ad satisfactionem pro peccatis. Petrus a Soto in Confessione sua Catholica dicit. Virginitatem seu Cælibatum, coram Dei tribunali magni meriti, quia sit satisfactio peccatorum maxima & meritum vitæ æternæ.* Chemnic. Exam. Conc. Trid. Sess. 8. cap. 1. In quibus Cas. &c. p. 9, 10. Item p. 11. *Fingunt Pontificii se per Cælibatum supererogare; Ideo Conjugium vocant statum Imperfectionis, Cælibatum vero statum perfectionis, & propter illam persuasionem sui meriti & supererogationis opera vendunt, communicant & applicant aliis qui sunt in statu imperfectionis. Hinc Bernhardinus fingit Monachos & Sanctimoniales substantialibus suis votis non pro suis tantum peccatis, verum etiam pro fundatorum, & aliorum benefactorum peccatis satisfacere.* The Papists (saith he) *when they dispute concerning the final cause of Virginity, or the Celibate Vow, for what end, and for what cause it should be taken and kept, they openly teach, That therefore this should be done, because it is satisfaction for sin, and doth merit Salvation and eternal life.* And he citeth *Pighius*, saying, *That such Vows do merit God's grace and favour, that they are of force to satisfie for sins.* And *Petrus a Soto* in these words, *That Virginity, or the Celibate state, is of great merit before God's Tribunal, because it is the greatest satisfaction for sins, and doth merit eternal life.* And he telleth us, *the Papists feign by this Celibate state, that they supererogate, and that therefore they call the Conjugal state a state of imperfection, but the Celibate state a state of perfection, and their meritorious works they sell and apply to others.* And he citeth *Bernhardinus*, who doth affirm, *That Monks and others under this Celibate Vow, do satisfie hereby not only for their own sins, but also for the sins of their Founders and other Benefactors.*

Now the Doctrine of Merit in man of eternal life, is devilish and wicked; which will necessarily infer that the Doctrine which introduceth this, and which propoundeth this as its chief motive and inducement, is devilish and wicked too.

That the Doctrine of Merit in man of eternal life, is devilish and wicked, I shall shew in three Propositions. 1. It is devilish and wicked to assert that any really good works which God hath commanded, are meritorious of eternal life. 2. It is much more devilish and wicked to say, that works of supererogation, such as the Papists make this Celibate Vow to be, are thus meritorious. 3. It is most of all devilish and wicked to assert the Celibate Vow (which really is, especially to some, a great sin) to be thus meritorious.

1. It is devilish and wicked to assert that any really good works which God commandeth are meritorious of eternal life; because, 1. This leadeth

leadeth back unto the Covenant of Works. 2. This proceedeth from ignorance. 3. This leadeth unto pride and boaſting. 4. This caſteth a diſparagement upon the Merits of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

1. This leadeth back unto the Covenant of Works, the Tenour of which is, *Do this and live.* Such as hope for life for any really good works which they do, they fall off from the Covenant of Grace, and they fall back unto the Covenant of Works, which will prove altogether inſufficient for life unto any in their lapſed eſtate, *Gal.* 3. 21. *If there had been a Law given which could have given life, verily righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the Law.* Therefore ſuch are bewitched by the Devil and his Inſtruments, who, forſaking the way of life which God hath appointed by the promiſes of Grace in the Goſpel, do look for life by any of the works of the Law. And hence it is that the Apoſtle in the beginning of this Chapter doth blame the *Galatians* for their folly and faſcination in their ſeeking righteouſneſs and life by the merit of any works; and he proveth by ſeveral Arguments that this was attainable only by Faith.

2. This proceedeth from ignorance: ſuch as hold really good works to be meritorious of eternal life, they are either ignorant of the imperfection of ſuch works, or they are ignorant of God who requireth the moſt abſolute and exact perfection in the works, for the ſake of which he will give eternal life. Such as do not ſee the defects and imperfections of their beſt works, are unacquainted with themſelves, and the ſtrictneſs of God's Law; and they, who are without the Spirit to diſcern this, their works (whatever they may think of them) are ſo far from being perfect, that they are not really, ſpiritually and acceptably good in the ſight of God: And ſuch who imagine a meritorioufneſs in imperfectly good works, in works mingled with ſin, (as the beſt works of the beſt men ſince the fall are) they are unacquainted with the infinite Holineſs and Righteouſneſs of God, which would engage him to puniſh the moſt holy men for the ſins of their moſt holy performances, had they not intereſt in the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt by Faith. But the god of this World (namely, the Devil) hath ſo far blinded the eyes of his Children the Papiſts, as to keep them ignorant both of God and themſelves too, in his perſwading them that any of their works are meritorious of eternal life.

3. This leadeth unto pride and boaſting, *Rom.* 3. 27. *Where is boaſting? it is excluded. By what Law? of works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* Chap. 4. 2. *For if Abraham were juſtified by works, he hath whereof to glory.* Such as aſſert the meritorioufneſs of life in really good works, they aſſert Juſtification by ſuch works, there being a Concatenation between the one and the other; and hence doth ariſe boaſting, and the glorying of pride, which ſin being the Condemnation of the Devil, he is the great Promoter of it, and Prompter unto it in his Subjects the Papiſts, by filling them with arrogant thoughts of the meritorioufneſs

rioufneſs of their works, whereby they ſacrifice to their own Nets, and rob God of the Glory which is due to his Name.

4. This caſteth a diſparagement upon the Merits of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as if there were either no Merit, or but an imperfect Merit of eternal life in his Righteouſneſs. If Chriſt's perfect Righteouſneſs be alone meritorious of eternal life and happineſs, (as the truth is) then there is no need of our Righteouſneſs to merit this life; although there be need upon other accounts, namely, by way of gratitude to the Lord, by way of evidence to our ſelves of our ſincerity, and to prepare us for eternal life. But if our Righteouſneſs or good works (however imperfect) are meritorious of eternal life, (as the Papiſts affirm) then there is no need of Chriſt's Merit and Righteouſneſs, and the Papiſts could well enough ſpare him, ſuppoſing they might be happy by the merit of their own good works. But I queſtion whether Chriſt will ſpare them in another ſenſe, when he cometh to reckon with them for the contumelies and diſparagements which they have caſt upon his Merits by this deviliſh Doctrine concerning the meritorioufneſs of good works, whereby they gratifie the Devil (Chriſt's great Enemy) unto the ruine of their own Souls. And if it be deviliſh and wicked to aſſert the meritorioufneſs of really good works,

2. It is much more deviliſh and wicked to aſſert works of Supererogation to be meritorious. Works of Supererogation, according to the Papiſts, are ſuch works which we have no precept for, but for which there are Evangelical Counſels, in order to the attainment of more than ordinary perfection; and by theſe works the Papiſts affirm that a man or woman may merit not only for themſelves, but alſo for others; and ſuch a work they aſſert this of the Celibate Vow and ſtate to be. The deviliſhneſs of this Aſſertion will appear in that,

1. There are no ſuch works as works of Supererogation: for thoſe works which the Papiſts ſo term, are either good or evil; if evil, they are beneath thoſe which are commanded; if they are good works, they are commanded, otherwiſe they could not be good works, their goodneſs ariſing from their conformity to the command. Whatever work tranſgreſſeth the command, is ſin; whatever work tranſgreſſeth not the command, is duty, and ſo cannot be a work of Supererogation. Unto which Argument I may add another, That if all men fall ſhort of their duty, they cannot do any work of Supererogation which is more than their duty: the former is ſo great a truth, that every truly humble Chriſtian will acknowledge; and therefore the latter will follow, that there can be no works of Supererogation, which none but a proud Papiſt will aſſert. What the Papiſts plead as to Evangelical Counſels, when they have proved them to be more or other than Evangelical Commands, ſome queſtion may be made of the firmneſs of my Argument; but this they will never do.

2. And

2. And if there be no ſuch works of Supererogation, be ſure there can be no merit in them, no not for themſelves that do them, and much leſs for others: the Scripture is clear againſt the meritoriouſneſs of all good works which are commanded, *Luk.* 17. 10. *So likewiſe ye, when ye have done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay, We are unprofitable ſervants, we have done that which was our duty to do.* And if thoſe works which are commanded be not meritorious, much leſs can thoſe works be meritorious which are not commanded: and if the beſt works cannot be profitable to our ſelves by way of merit, much leſs can they be profitable by way of merit unto others. I have ſometimes wondered that any of the Papiſts that are learned ſhould be ſo far befool'd and deluded by the Devil, as really to believe that there can be ſuch works of Supererogation, whereby men make God their Debtor for more than he doth or can pay to themſelves, and therefore that he is obliged to pay it unto others upon their account; the Aſſertion being ſo horribly impious and abſurd, ſo diſhonourable unto God, and ſo derogatory unto Jeſus Chriſt.

3. But thirdly, It is of all moſt deviliſh and wicked to aſſert the Celibate Vow and ſtate (which really is, eſpecially to ſome, a great ſin) to be meritorious of eternal life. I have already proved that it is a ſin for any to vow and live in a Celibate ſtate, who have not the gift; and yet the Papiſts, being taught by the Devil, do aſſert that this is meritorious. I grant indeed that it is meritorious of eternal Death and Damnation; but to ſay it is meritorious of eternal Life and Salvation, is as much as if they ſhould ſay that the wages of ſin is eternal life, which none but the Devil can put into the minds of any to imagine, when it is ſo contrary unto reaſon, and the expreſs words of the Apoſtle.

Arg. 4. That Doctrine which is a Badge or Character of Antichriſt, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a Badge or Character of Antichriſt: Therefore this Popiſh Doctrine is deviliſh and wicked.

The Badge and Character of Antichriſt is deviliſh and wicked, Antichriſt being called in the Scripture, *the wicked one, the man of ſin, the ſon of perdition*, 2 Theſſ. 2. 3, 8. He ſtileth himſelf Chriſt's Vicar, but he is Chriſt's great Antagoniſt; and though he be called *Holy Father*, by ſuch as are of the Romiſh Church, yet he is indeed the firſt-born ſon of the Devil: He is called in regard of his power *the Beaſt that aſcendeth out of the bottomleſs pit, and goeth into perdition*, Rev. 17. 8. and is deſcribed to be full of Names of Blaſphemy, Verſe 3. and *his coming* is ſaid to *be after Satan, with all power, and ſigns, and lying wonders, and with all deceiveableneſs of unrighteouſneſs*, 2 Theſſ. 2. 9, 10. Antichriſt then being inſpired and acted by the Devil, and ſo fraught with wickedneſs, that Doctrine which is a Badge and Character of him, muſt needs be deviliſh and wicked. Now that this Popiſh Doctrine which forbid-

deth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is the Badge and Character of Antichriſt, is evident in the Text. As the Scripture doth foretel that Antichriſt ſhould ariſe in the latter times, ſo it doth give ſeveral Characters whereby Antichriſt might be known when he ſhould make his appearance in the World, that the true Church of Chriſt might be aware of him: And as there are ſeveral plain Characters of Antichriſt together in 2 *Theſſ.* 2. from the 3. Verſe to the 13. Verſe; ſo the ſame Apoſtle doth give ſeveral Characters of the ſame Antichriſt in the Text, all which are applicable unto the Roman Papacy, or Church of *Rome*, as I have ſhewn in the explication of the Text, amongſt which Characters this is one, *That it forbiddeth to marry.* The Reply of Popiſh Writers unto this Text, is this, *That the Prohibition of Marriage here ſpoken of, is the Prohibition of all Marriage, whereas they do not forbid all Marriage; and that the Apoſtle hath here a reſpect unto the* Manichees, *who condemned Marriage it ſelf.* For anſwer unto which, 1. There is no ſuch thing in the Text as *Prohibition of all Marriage*; and it is certain that ſuch who *forbid the Marriage* of ſome, do *forbid to marry.* 2. St. *Auſtin* telleth us, that the *Manichees* did not *forbid the Marriage* of all, they allowed the *Marriage* of them which they called *Auditors*, although not the *Marriage* of them which they called *Elect*; therefore by all that the Papiſts can ſay, they cannot ſtave off this *Character of Antichriſt* from the Roman Papacy.

This ſhall ſuffice for the proof, that *the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry, is deviliſh and wicked.*

3. The third thing I am to do, is to anſwer the Popiſh Arguments which they bring to prove the unlawfulneſs of the *Marriage of the Clergy*, and ſuch who are under the Celibate Vow.

Arg. 1. Their firſt Argument is drawn from the uncleanneſs which they affirm to be contracted by *Marriage*, ſuch as the *Clergy*, and all who are more immediately devoted unto God, muſt abſtain from: This they endeavour to prove, 1. By the Levitical uncleanneſs, which we read of *Lev.* 15. and the ſpeech of *Abimelech* unto *David*, 1 *Sam.* 21. 4. 2. Such as are *married*, they ſay, are in the fleſh, therefore unclean, and ſo cannot pleaſe God, *Rom.* 8. 8. 3. They argue that if ſuch as would give themſelves to prayer and faſting, muſt abſtain for a while, 1 *Cor.* 7. 5. and that becauſe of the uncleanneſs herein; then *Miniſters* who give themſelves wholly to the *Miniſtry of the Word and unto Prayer*, muſt abſtain altogether, and therefore they ought not to *marry*, becauſe of the uncleanneſs they will hereby contract, which is unbeſeeming their ſacred Function.

Anſw. 1. There is no uncleanneſs or unholineſs in *Marriage* it ſelf, or in any uſe thereof, which is evident, becauſe *Marriage* was inſtituted in *Paradiſe*, in the ſtate of man's innocency; and *Marriage* being God's Ordinance, muſt needs be holy, becauſe all God's Ordinances are ſo. Moreover, the Scripture calleth *Marriage* honourable in all, where the

Bed

bed is undefiled by *Adultery*, *Heb.*13.4. and if *Marriage* be honourable in all, then it is holy, (for every ſin is diſhonourable) and therefore it is not unbeſeeming the moſt ſacred Function. When the Apoſtle doth exhort, 1 *Theſ.*4.3,4. *that every one ſhould know how to poſſeſs his veſſel in ſanctification and honour*, it is not by abſtaining from *Marriage*, but *by abſtaining from Fornication*. Adultery and Fornication indeed do both wound and ſtain the ſpirit, as well as pollute the body; but there is a real innocency, holineſs and chaſtity in *Marriage*, and the uſe of it according unto God's Ordinance.

2. The Papiſts will find it difficult to prove that there was ever any Levitical uncleanneſs by the uſe of *Marriage*, that Scripture in *Lev.* 15. ſpeaking of ſomething elſe, as will appear unto ſuch as read, and ſeriouſly weigh the place. What they urge from *Abimelech*'s ſpeech unto *David*, will appear not to be uncleanneſs by the lawful uſe of *Marriage*, for then it would have been unlawful for the *married Prieſts* continually to eat of the hallowed bread, which who will ſay they were not allowed to do? but *Abimelech*'s ſpeech was either concerning the unlawful uſe of women, or of their coming near their wives in the time of their ſeparation. But beſides this, and more which might be ſaid, did not modeſty forbid, if the Papiſts could prove Levitical uncleanneſs to have been herein, which they cannot do; yet what can thence be argued, the Levitical Law being now abrogated? can they ſay that which rendred the Jews in thoſe days legally unclean, doth now render Chriſtians morally unclean? May we not from hence argue for the *Marriage of Miniſters*, rather than find any ſhew of Argument againſt their *Marriage*? For if the *Prieſts*, notwithſtanding this Levitical uncleanneſs, which the Papiſts do here underſtand, did *marry* without ſin; how much more may *Miniſters* without ſin now *marry*, when all Levitical uncleanneſſes are at an end?

3. It is a groſs miſ-interpretation of *Rom.* 8.8. to apply it unto *married perſons*, as if they were the perſons ſpoken of by the Apoſtle *that are in the fleſh*, and *cannot pleaſe God*. Who will or can upon Scripture-grounds ſay, that all *married Chriſtians*, though never ſo holy and unblameable in their Converſation, are in the fleſh? Can none pleaſe God that are *married*? Hence then it will follow, that no *married perſons* can be ſaved, becauſe none in the fleſh, none that do not pleaſe God, ſhall attain his Salvation. But ſurely the Papiſts will not damn all *married perſons*; however they may deal with ours, ſurely they will ſpare their own.

4. As to their inference from 1 *Cor.*7.5. becauſe ſuch as would give themſelves to faſting and prayer, muſt abſtain for a while, therefore Miniſters muſt abſtain from *Marriage* altogether, is ſuch a *non ſequitur*, as the Schools will hiſs at. 1. The Apoſtle maketh no ſuch inference all along the Chapter againſt the *Marriage of Miniſters*, but on the contrary preſcribeth *Marriage* as the duty of all who cannot contain. 2. There

is

is a great difference between the abstaining which the Apostle speaketh of, and the not *marrying* which the Papists plead for; although the Apostle exhorts *married persons* to separate themselves by consent for a time, that they might give themselves unto fasting and prayer, yet in the same Verse and breath he bids them to come soon together again, lest Satan should tempt them for their incontinency. And who can rationally infer hence the duty of *Ministers* to abstain from *Marriage*? 3. The fasting and prayer here spoken of, which calls for *married persons* abstaining, it is fasting and prayer upon some extraordinary occasion, either publick or private, when *the Bridegroom is to come forth of his Chamber, and the Bride out of her Closet*, as *Joel* 2. 17. and not of ordinary prayer and seeking of God: And unless *Ministers* were always to be engaged in solemn fasting and prayer, there is no shew of reason why from this place they should be obliged not to *marry*. And why may not the Papists as well argue, because *married persons* are to abstain from eating, that they may give themselves to fasting and prayer; therefore there is uncleanness and evil in eating; and that *Ministers* who are to give themselves unto the *Ministry* of the Word and prayer, ought to abstain from eating altogether? for this will follow as well as the other.

Arg. 2. The second Popish Argument is drawn from 1 *Cor.* 7. 1. *It is good for a man not to touch a woman.* And Vers. 8. *I say therefore unto the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I.* If it be good for the unmarried and widows to abide in a single estate like unto the Apostle, then say they, it is evil for such to *marry*; and therefore the Clergy should abstain from this evil.

Answ. 1. If it were an evil of sin for the unmarried and widows to *marry*, then it would not only be unlawful for the *Clergy*, and all under the Celibate Vow to *marry*, but it would be unlawful for any *Christians* whatsoever to *marry*, because all ought to abhor, refrain, and flee from that which is an evil of sin: And where is the concernment of *Ministers* more than others in this Scripture?

2. That may be good for some, which is evil for others: a single estate may be good and best for such as have the gift of continency, and are perswaded in their heart that in this estate they may most glorifie God; whereas this estate may be evil for such as are without this gift, or in likelihood may most glorifie God in a married estate.

3. It may be good at some time not to *marry*, namely, in the time of the Churches persecution; and all that have the gift at such a time, should chuse the Celibate estate, that they might be the more ready both to do and suffer for Christ, and be the more free from temptations to Apostacy: and the most that can be said of the good here spoken of, is, that it is the good of conveniency, not the good of absolute duty; unto which is opposed the evil of inconveniency, not the evil of sin. Indeed it is an evil of inconveniency, and an aggravation of calamity to

be

...married in times of perſecution, *for ſuch*, ſaith the Apoſtle, Verſ. 28. of this Chapter, *ſhall have trouble*, that is, greater trouble than others, *in the fleſh:* but it is the duty of all to make choice rather of this evil of greater trouble and inconveniency, than to expoſe themſelves unto the evil of ſin by uncleanneſs and incontinency.

4. The Apoſtle is ſo far from aſſerting it to be an evil of ſin for any in the worſt of times to *marry*, that he aſſerteth the quite contrary when there is a neceſſity for it, Verſ. 36. *If need ſo require, let him do what he will, he ſinneth not, let them marry.* And Verſ. 38. *So then he that giveth her in marriage doth well.* It is plain then by all to be ſeen, that the Popiſh Argument from this place is frivolous, and that it carrieth no ſhadow of good conſequence in it againſt the *Marriage* of the Clergy.

Arg. 3. The third Popiſh Argument is drawn from 1 *Cor.* 7, 32, 33, 34. *But I would have you without carefulneſs: He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may pleaſe the Lord: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may pleaſe his wife. There is a difference alſo between a wife and a virgin: The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, how ſhe may be holy in body and ſpirit; but ſhe that is married careth for the things of the world, how ſhe may pleaſe her husband.* The Argument from hence in reference unto Miniſters is this: Miniſters above all others are warned to take heed of entangling themſelves with the affairs and cares of this life, 2 *Tim.* 2. 4. and being devoted unto the Lord more immediately by the Office of their Miniſtry, they ought always to care for the things which belong to the Lord, how they may pleaſe the Lord. And becauſe *Marriage* doth engage in the former, and taketh off from the latter, as this Text doth intimate, therefore they ought to refrain *Marriage.*

Anſw. 1. It is not univerſally true, that all who are *unmarried do care for the things which belong to the Lord, how they may pleaſe the Lord*, and that hereby they are taken off from minding and caring for the things of the world. As to the latter, who intermeddle more with ſecular affairs than many of the Popiſh unmarried Clergy? Why do any of them exerciſe Temporal Juriſdiction, if their Celibate ſtate be in order to free them from worldly cares and buſineſs? As to the former, if ſo be that Adultery, Fornication, Murder, Sodomitical uncleanneſs, and other vile practices be pleaſing to the Lord, there are and have been many Popes and Popiſh Biſhops, many Prieſts, Jeſuites, Fryars, and other unmarried perſons under the Celibate Vow among the Papiſts, that with great induſtry have *cared for the things which belong unto the Lord, how they may pleaſe the Lord*, as I ſhall make evident in the Uſe: But hereby they will be found to have taken care not only of the things of the world, but of the things of the fleſh, how they may pleaſe the fleſh, and the things of the Devil, how they may pleaſe the Devil, whoſe ſervants and children they are.

2. Neither,

2. Neither, ſecondly, is it univerſally true, that ſuch as *are married do care for the things of the world*, chiefly, ſo as to neglect the things of God, as inſtance may be given in the holineſs of many *married perſons*, which the Scripture doth take notice of. It is ſaid, *Gen.* 5. 22. That *Enoch walked with God, after he begat Methuſalah, three hundred years, and begat ſons and daughters. Abraham*, who is called the *Friend of God*; *Moſes*, unto whom the *Lord ſpake face to face*; *Samuel*, who was ſo highly *in favour with God*; *David*, who was *a man after God's own heart*; *Iſaiah*, *Ezekiel*, and almoſt all the Prophets, were *married perſons*: and we hardly read of any in the Old Teſtament that were famous for integrity and zeal for God, but they were ſuch as were *married*. I have alſo given inſtance already in the New Teſtament-times of *married* Apoſtles, and did not they care for the things that belonged to the Lord, how they might pleaſe the Lord? And how many Miniſters are there now in the Conjugal ſtate, as eminent as any others whatſoever for their holy and ſtrict lives? Will not many of them ſay, that their Wives have been ſo far from engaging and entangling them in worldly cares, that on the contrary they have proved real helpers of them, and have taken off in a great meaſure the burthen of thoſe worldly cares, which lay more heavy upon them in their ſingle eſtate?

3. It is granted that *Marriage* is often-times an occaſion of more worldly care than a ſingle eſtate; and that ſingle perſons, who really are endowed with the gift of continency, have ordinarily the advantage of moſt freedom from perplexing trouble, and thoughtfulneſs about the World, and for attending upon the Lord with the leaſt diſtraction; yet ſuch ſingle perſons as are without the gift are expoſed unto more diſtraction, and that which is worſe, unto ſo much ſin, ſuch burnings of luſtful deſires, that they cannot attend upon the Lord acceptably, without the uſe of the remedy which God hath provided againſt incontinency.

4. Men may care for the things that belong unto the world moderately, and labour to pleaſe their wives in the Lord ſubordinately, and not tranſgreſs the bounds of their duty, yea to neglect this would be their ſin; and yet at the ſame time they may care for the things that belong to the Lord, how they may pleaſe the Lord chiefly: for if the one had been inconſiſtent with the other, the Apoſtle would have forbidden *Marriage* abſolutely, it being the abſolute indiſpenſable duty of all, and neceſſary unto Salvation, that they labour chiefly to pleaſe the Lord: but the Apoſtle profeſſeth the contrary, that *concerning Virgins he had no command from the Lord*, Verſ. 25. that is, to forbid them from the Lord to marry; but in caſe of neceſſity he lets them know that *Marriage* was their duty. Yet becauſe both men and women are more prone to exceed the bounds as to worldly cares and diſtraction in God's ſervice when married, eſpecially when full of Children, and little in the world to provide for them, or in a time of perſecution, then in the

ſingle

ſingle eſtate, endowed with the gift; therefore he doth expreſs himſelf thus as we read in the Scripture urged. But none can infer hence, that it is the will of the Lord that Miniſters ſhould not marry, who though they be devoted to the ſervice of God more immediately, and ought always to care for the things that belong to the Lord, above all others to pleaſe him, may do this in a married eſtate, as hath been ſhewn; and if there be any Argument in it againſt Marriage, it is an Argument againſt the Marriage of all Chriſtians, rather than againſt the Marriage particularly of Miniſters, the perſons the Apoſtle writing unto, and unto whom he gives the advice in this Chapter, being not Miniſters, but ordinary Chriſtians amongſt the *Corinthians*. The uttermoſt that can be argued from this place in reference unto Miniſters, is, that ſuch of them as are unmarried, and have the gift of continency in the time of the Churches perſecution, or in ſuch circumſtances of their condition in the World, that by Marriage they are likely to be plunged and incumbered with more worldly cares and diſtraction, and to be leſs ſerviceable unto the Lord in a married eſtate, than they are in the ſingle; that in ſuch a caſe they ought to continue ſingle, ſo long as God doth continue the gift unto them: but this is no Argument for the Popiſh forbidding the Marriage of the whole Clergy.

Arg. 4. The fourth Popiſh Argument is drawn from 1 *Tim.* 5. 11, 12. *But the younger widows refuſe, for when they have begun to wax wanton againſt Chriſt, they will marry, having damnation, becauſe they have caſt off their firſt faith.* Now the interpretation of, and the arguings of the Papiſts from this Scripture, may run thus: 1. That there was a ſociety of Widows maintained by the Church, more immediately devoted unto God, who were to continue in ſupplications and prayers night and day, as Verſ. 5. and that theſe Widows were under a vow to continue in their ſingle eſtate unto their lives end, that they might be the more fit for their employment; and this vow was their firſt faith, ſpoken of Verſ. 12. becauſe they entered into this vow when they were firſt admitted into this ſociety. 2. That ſuch Widows as after this vow did marry, they waxed wanton hereby from Chriſt, and had damnation upon the account of their caſting off this their firſt faith, or breaking their Celibate Vow. 3. That if Widows, then Virgins too might be gathered into ſocieties to ſequeſter themſelves from all worldly affairs, for the more immediate ſervice of God, and enter into the ſame Celibate Vow. 4. That the Clergy of all ranks being by their Office devoted more immediately unto God, they ought to enter into the Celibate Vow, which they impoſe upon all in their admiſſion into ſacred Functions. 5. That all who have made this Celibate Vow, if afterward they attempt to marry, they incur the penalty not only of deprivation from men, but alſo of eternal damnation from God.

Anſw. 1. We grant that there was in the Primitive times a number of Widows devoted more immediately unto the ſervice of God, whom

the Church did maintain, and who were to be qualified according to what the Apostle doth mention, Vers. 9, 10.

2. It is as ealie for us to deny, as for them to affirm, that these Widows did enter into a Celibate Vow upon their first admission into this number, this Scripture making no mention of any such Vow, and therefore they can never prove it.

3. By the first faith here spoken of, it is more rational to understand it not of any Celibate Vow, but of their Vow in Baptism, (which is the first faith of Christians) whereby they were devoted unto the fear and service of the Lord all their days; and this, by their wantonness from Christ, or lascivious practices, and turning aside after Satan, spoken of Vers. 15. they did cast off, and for this they had damnation.

4. We deny that the sin of these Widows lay in their marrying, but in their wantonness and breach of faith with Christ, otherwise the Apostle would not have given direction that these younger women (although received into this number) should marry, bear Children, guide the House, and give no occasion (through wantonness) to the Adversary to speak reproachfully, as he doth Vers. 14. That the Apostle speaketh of younger women of the number, it is evident, because he saith that some of them had waxen wanton from Christ, had cast off their first faith, had turned aside after Satan; and therefore he doth direct concerning the rest of the younger women, to prevent these evils, that they should marry; and surely he would not have directed them to this, had it been a sin, and had their Marriage it self been a casting off of their first faith.

5. If we should suppose (although we do not grant) that by the first faith is meant a Celibate Vow; yet it doth not follow from hence, that either Virgins or younger Widows have leave from God to enter into such a Vow: for the Apostle doth straightly charge that no Widow for the future should be admitted into this number under threescore years old, at which years there is no such danger of their falling into wanton practices, Vers. 9. and younger Widows he would have refused, Vers. 11. And what plea then can there be from hence for the society of Nuns, and their Celibate Vows, when most of them are young at their first admission?

6. And if there can be from this place no good plea for younger women to enter into Celibate Vows, much less can there be any hence for the Celibate Vows of the Clergy.

7. Therefore it is sinful for any, especially younger men or women, to make Celibate Vows, when such Vows may not be in their own power to keep; and such who have rashly made them, it is a greater sin for them to keep, when they have not the gift of continency, than to break them by holy Wedlock, which they may do without the penalty of eternal damnation.

Arg. 5. The fifth and laſt Popiſh Argument is drawn from Authority. *Bellarmine*, after ſufficient weakneſs betrayed in his *Scripture-Proofs*, doth annex, 1. The Teſtimony of divers Councils, *Eaſtern*, *African*, *Italian*, *French*, *Spaniſh* and *German*. 2. The Teſtimony of divers Popes or Biſhops of *Rome*. 3. The Teſtimony of divers Fathers, both *Greek* and *Latine*. Should I repeat all which he maketh theſe to ſpeak, I ſhould weary both my ſelf and the Reader; and how infirm his Argumentation is from hence, will appear in the Anſwer.

Anſw. 1. It is well known by thoſe that are vers'd in Councils, and have written on this ſubject, that the Councils of *Ancyra*, *Nice*, *Gangra* and *Trull*, (the moſt ancient which *Bellarmine* and other Papiſts do cite) do not really favour this Popiſh Doctrine. One Canon of the Council of *Ancyra* hath this paſſage in it, Διάκονοι ὅσοι καθισταῖνται, &c. *All Deacons that are eſtabliſhed in their Charges, if they have declared that they have need to marry, and cannot remain as they are, let them remain in their ſervice after they are married:* and let any judge whether this could be conſiſtent with a general Prohibition of the Marriage of the Clergy. The Council of *Nice* indeed did decree, *That no Biſhop, Preſbyter or Deacon, ſhould have any women in their houſes except Mother, Siſter, or Aunt*; therefore they were prohibited, ſaith *Bellarmine*, the having Wives, and ſo ought not to marry: whereas it is evident unto all that are unbyaſſed by prejudice, and make an impartial ſearch into the Records of that Council, that this Prohibition did not ſhut out the Wives, but unmarried Aſſociates, from the Houſes of Eccleſiaſticks that were ſingle, for the prevention of ſcandal by Fornication, which ſingle perſons living together, eſpecially in their youth and privacy, might be tempted unto.

Let us ſee what *Socrates* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory doth relate concerning the Tranſactions of this Council about this point; which we ſhall find to this purpoſe: *Some would have brought in a new Law, to forbid the Clergy to cohabit with their Wives; but* Paphnutius *a Confeſſor, and although unmarried himſelf, ſtood up and vehemently cryed out, That Marriage was honourable, congreſs with the Wife chaſte, and therefore did counſel them not to lay ſuch a heavy yoke upon perſons in holy Orders which they could not bear, and hereby give occaſion both to them and their Wives to live incontinently: upon which ſpeech of* Paphnutius *the Council did both approve, and praiſe his ſentence, made no ſuch Law, but left it to every mans liberty to do what he would in that point.* Socr. Lib. 1. Cap. 11. Sozom. Lib. 1. Cap. 23. Here we ſee that this Law (now eſtabliſhed amongſt the Papiſts) is called *a new Law*, it was never Enacted before, and it was only a Law which ſome would have brought in, and therefore was not Enacted then: it was called *a heavy yoke*, and not being found by that Council to be Chriſt's yoke, it was laid aſide. The Council of *Gangra*, (all whoſe Canons the Council of *Trull* doth approve of) hath this Canon: Εἴ τις διακρίνοιτο, &c. *If any make a difference*

of a married Prieſt, as if none ought to partake of the Oblation when he doth the ſervice, let him be Anathema. I might give other inſtances of paſſages in other Councils, which *Bellarmine* doth make mention of, to ſhew how he doth corrupt many of their ſayings, in favour of this Doctrine; but I refer the learned Reader unto *Chamier*'s anſwer; and to *Junius*'s Animadverſions upon *Bellarmine*'s Controverſies. It is moſt certain, (if Hiſtory may be believed) that the moſt ancient and moſt authentick Councils, according to their moſt authentick Copies, did never (like the Papiſts) forbid the Marriage of the Clergy, whatever ſome of them may ſeem to do in the corrupt Tranſlations of them, and falſe Gloſſes upon them by the Papiſts: the Canons of ſome particular Councils, or rather Popiſh Synods of latter date, are of no great ſignification in the proof of this point.

2. The Teſtimonies which *Bellarmine* bringeth of Popes, or the Biſhops of *Rome*, carry no weight: It is acknowledged by the moſt, that Pope *Syricius* firſt did forbid the Marriage of the Clergy, but what he did was very unjuſt: hear what *Junius* doth ſay of it: *Syricius contra Verbum Dei & Jus naturale ipſum voluit iſtud cœlibatus jugum Eccleſiaſticis imponere, & juris ignorantia, & ſuperſtitioſa cacozelia.* Syricius *againſt the Word of God, and the Law of Nature it ſelf, would needs lay the Celibate Law upon Eccleſiaſticks through ignorance and ſuperſtitious Zeal.* I ſhall readily grant, That the Biſhops of *Rome*, eſpecially of latter years ſince the Apoſtacy of that Church unto Hereſie, Antichriſtianiſm and Idolatry, have been generally againſt the Marriage of the Clergy: but wherefore hath this been? Not out of true Zeal for Chaſtity, and the purity of all in ſacred Orders, as is pretended; but out of carnal Policy, for the enriching of their Church hereby, and the preſerving of its Revenues, which might be too profuſely expended and alienated in the providing for Wife and Children.

3. The Teſtimonies which are brought out of ancient Fathers for the moſt part are either corrupted, or they do not militate againſt the Marriage, but againſt the incontinency of the Clergy; and the purity which the Fathers ſpeak of, as requiſite in perſons of that Function, is as well conſiſtent with a married, as with a ſingle eſtate, and more ordinarily to be found in the former, than in the latter. But if ſome of the Fathers were againſt the Marriage of Eccleſiaſticks, this doth not prove the unlawfulneſs of ſuch Marriages, unleſs it could be proved to be ſo by the Word of God; and this the Papiſts can never prove unto ſuch who do look into the Scriptures with an unprejudiced mind, when they are ſo plain and clear for the univerſal lawfulneſs of Marriage without any particular exceptions.

Uſe 1. Here you may ſee the deviliſh wickedneſs of the Church of *Rome*; it would both ſpend too much time, and carry me beſides my purpoſe too far, to ſet forth the wickedneſs of this Apoſtate Church in the full latitude thereof; I ſhall only ſpeak of the wickedneſs which this

Doctrine

Doctrine that forbiddeth to marry, is the occaſion of. There are three woful effects which this wicked deviliſh Doctrine hath produced: 1. Wicked Indulgencies of their Popes: 2. Wicked Principles of their Jeſuites: 3. Wicked Practices both of their Popes and others under the Celibate Vow.

1. The Popes or Biſhops of *Rome*, however ſevere againſt the Marriage of their Clergy, yet they have given Indulgencies for Whoredom, Sodomy, and ſuch like moſt foul abominations. Hear the complaints as well as acknowledgments of *Eſpencæus*, a Writer of their own, *Lib. 2. Cap. 7. De Continentia*; his words are theſe: *Pro puro mundoque cælibatu ſucceſſit impurus & immundus concubinatus, ut quod eleganter de perſecutione, cap. 29. Conquerebatur D. Bernardus, latere, nec præ multitudine queat, nec præ impudentia quærat: hæc inquam tolerantia altius radices egit, permiſſis alicubi ſub annuo cenſu clericis atque laicis cum ſuis concubinis cohabitare: Quod utinam falſo & imerito extaret inter Gravamina Germaniæ; adeoque etiam continentibus ad omnem cenſum perſolvendum coactis, quo ſoluto iis liceret, vel continentibus vel incontinentibus eſſe. O rem execrandam! In ſtead of the pure and clean Celibate, there hath ſucceeded an impure and unclean Concubinate, which, as* Bernard *elegantly complaineth in his 29 Chapter concerning Perſecution, neither can be concealed, it is ſo frequent, neither doth ſeek to be concealed, it is ſo impudent: this Toleration or Indulgence hath got firm footing, both the Clergy as well as Laity having permiſſion given unto them to cohabit with their Concubines, upon the payment of a yearly ſum of money. And I wiſh that theſe things were falſly and undeſervedly extant amongſt the Grievances of* Germany, *who complain that even ſuch as are continent are forced to pay the annual Rent; which being paid, they are at their own choice whether they will contain or not, whether they will have a Concubine, otherwiſe called a Whore, or not. O execrable wickedneſs!* And the ſame Author in his Comment upon *Titus*, doth further acknowledge in theſe words: *Epiſcopi, Archidiaconi & Officiales plerunque dum Diœceſes & Paræcias obequitant, non tam facinoroſos & criminum reos pœnis & correctionibus a vitiis deterrent, quam pecunia emungunt & exugunt tum Clericos, tum laicos; & hos cum concubinis, pellicibus & meretriculis cohabitare, liberoſque procreare ſinunt, accepto ab iis certo quotannis cenſu atque adeo alicubi accipiunt a continentibus; habeat (aiunt) ſi velit, & quoties enim quiſque talis, (cum tales tamen tam multi ſunt) hodie aliter punitur? Biſhops, Archdeacons and Officials, do ride about their Dioceſſes and Pariſhes for the moſt part, not to deter the wicked by corrections and puniſhments from their vice, but to draw out and defraud both Clergy and Laity of their Money, whom upon the payment of a yearly Revenue, they permit to cohabit with Concubines and Whores, and to procreate Children. And this Revenue they receive in ſome places of the Continent, for he may have a Concubina or Whore (ſay they) if he pleaſe. And how often are ſuch Prieſts as keep Whores (although ſo many) puniſhed*

other-

otherwiſe? There is a Book lately publiſhed by *Anthony Egans*, B. D. late Confeſſor-General of the Kingdom of *Ireland*, and now Miniſter of the Goſpel according to the Reformed Religion. The Title of it is this, *The Book of Rates now uſed in the Sin-Cuſtom-Houſe of the Church and Court of* Rome, *containing the Bulls, Diſpenſations and Pardons for all manner of villanies and wickedneſs, with the ſeveral ſums of Moneys given and to be paid for them.* Page 13. there are theſe Diſpenſations for Prieſts and others under the Celibate Vow: *A Prieſt or Fryar having lain, or carnally ſinned with a Woman of whatſoever ſort or degree, whether a Nun, or Kinſwoman, or a Relation, or with any other whether married or ſingle, whether within the Bounds or Cloiſters of his Monaſtery, or elſewhere, whether the Abſolution be made in the Name of the Clergy or no, it gives him power to exerciſe his Function, and to hold his Livings, and that together with the Inhibitory Clauſe, he paying* 36 l. 9 s. and 6 d. *And if beſides this there be an Abſolution for Buggery, or for unnatural ſin committed with bruit Beaſts, a Diſpenſation, together with the Inhibitory Clauſe, will come to* 90 l. 12 s. 1 d. *A ſimple Abſolution for the ſin of Buggery, or the ſin contrary to Nature, that is to ſay, with bruit Beaſts, together with a Diſpenſation, and the Inhibitory Clauſe, is* 36 l. 9 s. *A Nun having played the Whore very often, aut intra aut extra ſepta Monaſterii, within or without the bounds of the Monaſtery, is to be abſolved and rehabilited to hold the Dignity of her Order for* 36 l. 9 s. *An Abſolution for one that keeps a Whore at Bed and Board, with a Diſpenſation to hold a Beneſice, is* 4 l. 5 s. 6 d. *Prideaux* telleth us of Pope *Sixtus* the fourth, *That he made a grant unto the Cardinal of* Lucia *to uſe unnatural luſts for three months in the year, namely,* June, July, *and* Auguſt: but whether the Cardinal had the Diſpenſation *gratis*, or paid a ſum of money for it, the Author doth not relate. This is that Pope who built a Stews at *Rome* of his own coſt, and well might he do it, when the Popes do receive ſuch Revenues from ſuch baſe Houſes. See *Cornelius Agrippa de Vanitate Scientiarum*, *Cap.* 64. Lycurgus *and* Solon (ſaith he) *thoſe Heathen Law-givers, erected publick Stews, but that is no marvel, for of late years Pope* Sixtus *the fourth builded a goodly Stews in* Rome. *The* Corinthians, Cyprians, *and* Babylonians, *did encreaſe their Revenue by the gain of Stews, which in* Italy *alſo at this day is no unuſual matter; for Whores of* Rome *do pay weekly to the Pope a* Julio, *the whole Revenue whereof in the year doth often exceed twenty thouſand Duckets.* Hence it is that one of their Poets doth complain,

Roma ipſa Lupanar
Reddita; nunc facta eſt toto execrabilis orbe.

"That *Rome* was become a Brothel-Houſe, and grown execrable "throughout the whole World.

The

The Pope indeed will not allow of Marriage in his Clergy, but by his Indulgencies he doth make proviſion for their fleſh, that they may fulfil their luſts by Fornications and all manner of uncleanneſſes, which may bring in filthy lucre into his Coffers. Thus concerning the wicked Indulgencies of the Pope.

2. The wicked Principles of the Jeſuites is another effect of this Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry. The Jeſuitical Doctors pretend to more Sanctity, Learning and Subtilty than others; let us ſee what ſome of their Principles be, and Poſitions in their ſtating of Caſes of Conſcience concerning uncleanneſſes. I ſhall refer the Reader only unto a Book called, *The Myſtery of Jeſuitiſm*, ſee Vol. 1. p. 147. Father *Bauny* hath this Aſſertion as it is cited out of his Theolog. Mor. trac. 4. de pœnit. p. 94. *It is lawful for perſons of all qualities and conditions to go into the places of common proſtitution, there to convert ſinful women, although it be very probable that they will commit the ſin there themſelves; nay haply though they have found by frequent experience that they are drawn into ſin by the ſight and inſinuations of thoſe women.* Who ſeeth not that this Aſſertion doth give encouragement unto the unmarried Popiſh Clergy to run upon occaſions, and manifeſt temptations unto the ſin of filthy Fornication? For who are more fit, may they think, to convert thoſe ſinful women, than Eccleſiaſtical perſons? But for ſuch to go into places of common proſtitution to do it, is both ſcandalous for any, eſpecially for Miniſters, and dangerous leſt themſelves be entangled and defiled hereby. But the Jeſuite telleth us, they may venture into ſuch places, although it be probable they will, and though they have been often drawn into that foul ſin hereby; and what is it that they can plead for the lawfulneſs of ſuch practice? it is only this, their directing their intention to convert ſinful women; and may they run into their embraces that they may convert them? may they venture upon a probability of being drawn by them unto this ſin, that without any probability of ſucceſs they may draw them from it? and when they have been often enticed and overcome, may they put their foot again into the ſnare? are ſuch like to perſwade others to repentance and chaſtity, who have been often unclean in ſuch places themſelves? But let us ſee further what other of their Doctors ſay: In the *Additionale*, pag. 96. *Eſcobar* doth aſſert, *That a man who hath the reputation of being extreamly given to women, doth not commit any mortal ſin in ſollicituing a woman to condeſcend unto his deſires, when he doth not intend to put his deſign in execution.* This Doctor goeth a ſtep further, the former giveth allowance to go into places of common proſtitution, ſo that the intention be the converſion of ſinful women; and this telleth us that it is no mortal ſin to ſollicite women to be naught, if a man can but hold off his intention from the thing: but who is there that is extreamly addicted to women, and doth ſollicite, though he doth not actually intend the thing, till he knows the mind of the party, but if there be a compliance,

compliance, that will forbear and withdraw himself, as *Joseph* from his Mistress? May lecherous Mass-Priests sollicite women to lewdness without mortal sin? Who can deny this to be deviliſh wicked Doctrine? But although the Jesuites Principles do lead their Clergy to Fornication and Adultery, yet they would have them cautious that such impure facts of theirs may not be known, *si non caste, tamen caute.* If they do not live chastly, they would have them sin warily; and therefore they allow most horrid wickedness for the concealing such shame. P. 19. *Caramuel* asserteth in his *Fund. Theolog. Fund.* 55. *Sect.* 7. *That it is doubtful whether a religious man having made use of a woman, may not kill her, if she offer to discover what passed between them.* This Doctor doth make a doubt whether it be not lawful for their Priests to commit Murder that they may conceal their Adultery. But what if the woman the Priest is naught withal, be a wife, and she reveal nothing, but her husband cometh unawares upon them, and discovereth the fact? see what *Escobar* saith in such a case, cited pag. 94. out of his Tract. Theol. Tract. 4. Exam. 6. Cap. 5. *An Ecclesiastick surprized in Adultery, if he kill the womans husband whom he hath abused in his own defence, is not for that irregular.* Here the Doctor doth favour not only the murder of the wife if she reveal, but also the murder of the husband if he resist; and although the Marriage of Eccleſiasticks doth make them irregular, yet their Adulteries and Murders do not so, but they may according to these Principles continue in their Function, notwithstanding such horrid abominations. You see what provisions the Jesuites make for themselves and others of the Romish Clergy, for their encouragement, reputation and safety in their practice of the sin of Adultery: but do they take no care for the poor forlorn Nuns, who are mewed up in Cloisters, and are under the same Celibate Vow with themselves? The great danger is, when the Priests and Jesuites come amongst them, of their proving with child, and so of their discovering their own shame: is there no provision in this case? Yes, these kind Fathers have a Principle which may be of use to such, to encourage them with a *non obstante* to this danger unto lewd embraces. See Addit. p. 19. Egidius Trullench. in Decal. Tom. 5. Lib. 5. Cap. 1. asserteth, *That it is lawful to procure abortion before the child be quick in the womb, to save a Maids life or reputation.* I shall add but one Position more concerning the liberty which the Jesuites give unto the most impure persons to communicate immediately upon their confession, pag. 88. *Mascarennas Tract. 4. de Sacr. Eucharist. Disp. 5. Cap. 7.* doth assert, *That either a secular person, or a Priest being fallen into any kind of impurity whatsoever, nay though such as are against Nature, may, without so much as the least venial sin, (nay, are to be commended for it if they do) communicate the very same day after they have made confession thereof. That the Confessor ought to advise his Penitent to receive the Eucharist the very same day that he is fallen into such crimes, and that the Vow or Reso-*

lution

lation any one might have made not to come to the Lord's Table in that condition, were null. Thus if the Jeſuites acknowledge that a wound and defilement is contracted by ſome groſſer impieties and impurities; yet they can, according to their principles, quickly lick themſelves whole by their Confeſſions, and waſh themſelves clean by their Communicating; and what is this but an abominable profaning and polluting of the holy Sacrament, and an opening a wide door to all manner of licentiouſneſs? The Harlot could ſay unto the young man, *Prov.* 7. 12. *This day I have payed my vows*, and ſo ſhe was fitted for her wickedneſs. And if unmarried Eccleſiaſticks by Confeſſion and Communicating can ſo eaſily wipe off their guilt and filth, what encouragement muſt this needs give them to return preſently again with the Dog to his vomit, and with the Sow that is waſh'd to her wallowing in the mire? That the Jeſuites are not belyed by the Author of the Myſtery of Jeſuitiſm, in theſe and other groſs Principles and Aſſertions which they hold, may eaſily be known by ſuch as will conſult their Books in print, out of which they are extracted: I confeſs I have not conſulted all of them, not having them by me; but having peruſed his Citations of *Eſcobar*, whom I have, and finding him faithful there, I doubt not but he is faithful in the reſt.

3. The wicked practices both of Popes and others under the Celibate Vow, is another woful effect of this Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry. And here I may well premiſe, that many thouſand lewdneſſes and foul abominations are and have been committed by Popiſh Votaries ſo ſecretly, that they never ſaw the light, neither have come abroad unto the notice of the world, theſe works being works of darkneſs which fly the light, and ſhrowd themſelves as cloſe as may be in dark corners, thoſe who are guilty endeavouring all they can to conceal their filthineſs; which however at the laſt day of revelation both of mens ſins and God's Judgments, will be made known and expoſed to the view both of men and Angels, *when the Lord will bring to light the hidden works of darkneſs, and make manifeſt all the counſels of the heart*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 5. Yet the wickedneſs of ſome Popes and their Clergy in this kind, hath been ſo notorious, that their own Hiſtorians have not thought fit to be altogether ſilent herein; and, as was ſaid before, their lewdneſs could not be concealed, it was ſo frequent, neither in many did it ſeek to be concealed, it was ſo impudent. It would ſpend more time than we have to be together, yea, although we ſhould ſtay here on this long Summers day till dark night, to enumerate the inſtances that might be given of the uncleanneſſes of Eccleſiaſticks in the Church of *Rome*. I ſhall mention only a few of the moſt remarkable amongſt many other, and begin with the viciouſneſs and filthineſs of the Popes, whoſe Title of Holineſs, and ſeverity againſt Matrimony, and impoſing the Celibate Vow upon others, one would think ſhould oblige themſelves unto more than ordinary mortification of fleſhly luſts, and exemplary chaſtity: but

we shall find by search into the History of the Popes lives, that they have generally been exceeding faulty as to women, and all sorts of filthy lusts. *Platina* doth complain that Riches had made the Church wanton, and Vice had no restraint. Pope *Sergius* the Third had his Sweet-heart *Marozia*, that famous Strumpet, who was the Mistress of his affections, and had no small Government in the Church, of whom in wicked Adultery, as *Luitprandus* doth record, he begat *John* the Eleventh, who afterward by his Mothers means got the Popedom. *Baronius* doth acknowledge that in those days the power of Harlots did so far prevail, that they both removed Popes rightly appointed, and also thrust in violent and wicked men into their room at their pleasure. By this *Marozia*'s means also it was that *Octavianus* (Son to *Albericus*) obtained the Popedom, called *John* the Twelfth, who, as *Baronius* doth relate, amongst other wickednesses, was accused in a Synod for abusing the Widow of *Rainerius*, for his filthiness with *Stephana* his Fathers Concubine, with *Anna* a Widow and her Neice. This is that Pope who castrated divers of his Cardinals because they favoured *Otho* the great; but if himself had been so served before he was made Pope, possibly he might have been more chaste: and yet whatever liberty this Pope took himself to commit Fornication and Adultery, he would not give liberty for Marriage to his Clergy, which God doth allow, for he sends over an Inhibition against Priests Marriage into *England*, which at that time caused no small stir: At length the hand of God was remarkable in the cutting off this Pope; for being taken one night in Adultery with another mans wife, he received such a wound in his Temples, that within the space of eight days after he died of it. Pope *Gregory* the Seventh (saith *Prideaux*) had his Minion *Matilda*, who left her own Husband to live with this holy Father. This is that *Gregory* who caused the Emperour *Henry* the Fourth, with his Empress, and Son, to come bare-footed in the cold Winter to his Castle at *Cannucium*, and there to wait three days fasting before he could have audience, which at length was obtained by the Mediation of Madam *Matilda*. *Platina* doth relate that in Pope *Honorius* the Second's time, one *Arnulphus* was put to death at *Rome* for his bitter invieghing against the pomp, luxury and lasciviousness of the Clergy, before whom he propounded the poverty of Christ, and his integrity of life for their imitation. It was from this Pope that *John Cremensis* was sent over Legat into *England*, to dissolve the Priests Marriages, but in the great heat of his urging his Commission, he was found in bed with a Whore. Good man! he would have all to live chastly without Wives and Matrimony, and he came over from *Rome* to shew them an example. Pope *Martin* the Fourth kept the Concubine of his Predecessor *Nicolas*, and removed all Bears from his Palace, lest the beholding of them should cause his Sweet-heart to bring forth a Bear; so fearful was he, that his bruitish lust would produce a bruitish off-spring. Pope *Benedict* the Twelfth is recorded to have bought

bought a beautiful young Woman of her Brother with a great ſum of money, that he might make uſe of her. Pope *Sixtus* the Fourth before-mentioned, who built the Stews at *Rome*, and allowed unnatural luſts to the Cardinal, would not wholly deny himſelf, eſpecially in thoſe luſts which are more natural, for he had his Concubine *Tyreſia*, for whom he provided Shooes covered with Pearls. Pope *Innocent* the Eighth had many baſe Children, gave a great Dowry with his Daughter *Theodorina*: *Mantuan* hath theſe Verſes on him:

Octo Nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas,
Hunc merito poteris dicere Roma patrem.

The ſignification of which is, that this Nocent (not Innocent) perſon, had begotten eight Boys, and as many Girls, and therefore deſerved the name of a Father; but I ſuppoſe none, except the Papiſts, will ſay that he was a holy Father. Pope *Alexander* the Sixth did ſucceed him in the Papacy, and his Hiſtory doth record that he exceeded him in lewdneſs and Adultery; on whoſe Daughter there are theſe Verſes:

Hic jacet in tumulo Lucretia nomine, ſed re
Thais, Alexandri Filia, Sponſa, Nurus.

Lucrece *by name here lies, but* Thais *in life,*
Pope Alexand*'s Child, Sponſe, and Sons Wife.*

This Pope had two Baſtards, a Son, and this Daughter *Lucretia*, whom he married unto this Son, and afterwards abuſed her himſelf; and it is ſtoried of him, that to compleat his other wickedneſſes, he gave himſelf unto the Devil. Pope *Julius* the Second was not much better, who abuſed two ingenuous Youths ſent by the Queen of *France* to be bred in *Italy*. Pope *Clement* the Seventh was ſo infamous, that becauſe of his own lewdneſs, and that of his Court, this Diſtick was written:

Roma vale, vidi, ſatis eſt vidiſſe, revertar
Cum Leno, aut Meretrix, Scurra, Cinædus ero.

Vile Rome *adieu, I did thee view, but hence no more will ſee,*
Till Pimp or Punck, or Jade or Spade, I do reſolve to be.

Paul the Third proſtituted his Siſter *Julia Farneſia* to *Alexander* the Sixth, that he might be made Cardinal; committed Inceſt with his own Daughter *Conſtantia*, poiſoned her Husband that he might enjoy her the more freely; was naught with his own Siſter, and taken in the Act by her Husband; and beſides his Inceſt, he is recorded to have been a Necromancer, and from this Pope's piety came the Council of *Trent*.

Pope *Julius* the Third was not inferiour unto him, who gave his Cardinals Hat unto a Sodomitical Boy whom he had abuſed: This is that Pope who ſaid he would have his Pork (forbidden by his Phyſitian) in deſpight of God; and maintained he had more reaſon to be angry for the keeping back his cold Peacock Pye, than God had to caſt *Adam* out of Paradiſe for eating an Apple: ſuch a blaſphemous as well as luxurious Wretch was he! Thus *Prideaux*. I ſhall add but two inſtances more, of two famous Women, one a Pope, and the other a Popeſs: The Woman-Pope was Pope *Joan*, who ſucceeded *Leo* the Fourth, ſate in the Papacy two years and ſix months, ſuppoſed to be a man, until at length being with Child, ſhe fell in labour in the midſt of a ſolemn proceſſion, whereby her Sex and lewdneſs were diſcovered together: hereupon there was an Image of a Woman with Child ſet up in the ſame place, where the Pope was delivered both of her Child and her Life: Ever ſince the Popes when they go to the Laterane ſhun that Street, although the nearer way, in abhorrency of the fact, and memory thereof. There was moreover a Chair of Porphiry-ſtone kept in the Laterane, with a hole in the midſt to try the Sex of the new-elected: No leſs than fifty Popiſh Writers teſtifie the truth of this Hiſtory concerning Pope *Joan*. The other Woman was a Popeſs, as the Pope himſelf called her, namely, *Donna Olympia*, the Siſter-in-law and Miſtreſs of Pope *Innocent* the Tenth, who was perfectly at her devotion, not only in his younger years, and whilſt he was Biſhop and Cardinal, but alſo in his elder years when he was Pope, and ſo continued until the very laſt: the Hiſtory we have at large, written in *Italian* by *Gualdi*, and tranſlated into *Engliſh*; the Book is called, *The Life of* Donna Olympia Maldachini, *who Governed the Church during the time of* Innocent *the Tenth*. In the Preface of the Book there is this paſſage: *By the great example laid before us, they muſt needs confeſs that the Church-men of the Roman Faith will do any thing with a Woman but marry her.* I ſhall refer the Reader unto the Hiſtory, which relateth the great familiarities between this *Donna Olympia* and the Pope, having been too long in relating the viciouſneſs of his Predeceſſors, although I have paſſed by many perſons and things which might without wrong be ſpoken concerning them. I muſt add ſomething concerning the filthineſs and uncleanneſſes of the Popiſh Clergy, and others under the Celibate Vow. *Platina* doth record, that in Pope *Gregory* the Great's time there were ſix thouſand Infants Skulls found in a Fiſh-pond at *Rome*; and what did this ſignifie, but the Whordoms and Murders which this Celibate Vow was the occaſion of? *Nicholaus de Clemangis*, a Popiſh Archdeacon, who lived and flouriſhed in the year One thouſand four hundred and ſeventeen, he wrote a Book, *De corrupto ſtatu Eccleſiæ*, wherein he taketh notice of the viciouſneſs of all ſort of perſons, beſides the Pope, that were under this Celibate Vow. *Cap.* 12. Concerning the Cardinals, theſe are his words: *Nec enumerare volo eorum adulteria, ſtupra, fornicationes*

quibus

quibus Romanam Curiam infeſtant, nec referre obſcœniſſimam illorum familiæ vitam, a domeſtorum tamen moribus nullatenus abſonam. I will not relate the Adulteries, Rapes, Fornications, whereby theſe Cardinals do pollute the Court of Rome, *nor ſet out the moſt filthy life of their Family, not at all diſſonant from the Manners of their Maſters.* Cap. 19. Concerning the Prelates, he thus writes: *Qui totos in aucupio, & venatu dies agunt, qui noctes in conviviis acuratiſſimis, & chorœis cum puellis effœminati inſomnes tranſeunt, qui ſuo turpi exemplo gregem per devia abducunt in præcipitium. The Prelates ſpend whole days in fowling and hunting; and being effeminate, they ſpend whole nights in dancing and ſports with young women, and by their filthy example lead their Flock out of the right way upon a precipice.* Cap. 20. He calls the Regulars *Ebrios, incontinentiſſimos, utpote qui paſſim & inverecunde prolem ex Meretrice ſuſceptam, & ſcortam vice conjugum domi tenent. Et hoc Canonicos aliquis vocabit, qui ſic ab omni Canone ſeu Regula ſunt abalienati? Drunkards, and moſt incontinent perſons, who ordinarily and ſhamelefly do keep Whores in ſtead of Wives and Children by them at home in their houſes. And who will call them Regulars who walk by no Rule?* Cap. 21. Of the Monks he ſaith, *Quanto magis continentes, magis obedientes eſſe debebant minus vagabundi, & e Clauſtrorum ſeptis rarius egredientes in publicum; tanto ab his omnibus rebus licet eos videre magis alienos: pro labore deſidia, pro continentia & æquitate, libido & ſuperbia invaſere. By how much the more they ought to be continent and obedient, by how much the leſs they ought to wander about, and go forth into publick from the bounds of their Cloiſters; by ſo much the more we may ſee in them a contrary carriage and courſe unto theſe things: in ſtead of labour, ſloth; in ſtead of continence and juſtice, luſt and pride hath invaded them.* Cap. 22. Of the Mendicants he writes, *An non hi lupi rapaces ſunt ſub ovili imagine latitantes, qui more Sacerdotum Belis in ſuis penetralibus, oblata devorant mero & lautis epulis cum non ſuis uxoribus, licet ſæpe cum ſuis parvulis, avide ſatiantes, cunctaque libidinibus, quarum torrentur ardore, polluentes? Are not theſe Mendicants ravening Wolves under the form of Sheep, who like the Prieſts of* Bell *do devour what is offered, with others Wives and their own little Ones, greedily ſatiating themſelves in retired places with Wine and coſtly Banquets, and defiling all things by their filthy and burning luſts?* Cap. 23. Concerning Nuns and their Monaſteries, he thus expreſſeth himſelf: *De his plura dicere verecundia prohibet, ne non de cœtu Virginum Deo dicatarum, ſed magis de lupanaribus, de dolis & procacia meretricum, de ſtupris & inveſtuoſis operibus dandum ſermonem prolixe trahamus. Nam quid obſecro aliud ſunt hoc tempore puellarum Monaſteria niſi quædam. Non dico Dei ſanctuaria, ſed Veneris proſtibula, ſed laſcivorum & impudicorum juvenum ad libidines explendas receptacula? ut idem hodie ſit puellam velare, quod & publice ad ſcortandum exponere. Modeſty doth forbid to ſpeak more concerning theſe, leſt inſtead of ſetting forth a ſociety of Virgins devoted unto God, we ſhould de-*

ſcribe

scribe a Stews, and speak of the deceits and wantonness of Harlots, of Rapes and incestuous works. For what other are the Monasteries of young women in these times, than execrable Brothel-houses of Venus, *than the Receptacles wherein immodest and lascivious young men do fulfil their lusts? and at this day it is the same thing to put a Maid into a Monastery, and publickly to prostitute her, or put her forth to be a Whore.*

We see what kind of persons Celibate persons were formerly, how well they kept their Vow of Chastity, as one of themselves acknowledgeth; and have we reason to think they are grown better of later years? We see what they have been in other Countries; let us also see what they were before the breaking off the Romish Yoke in our own Land. In King *Henry* the Eighth's time a search was made into Monasteries and Religious Houses concerning the Life and Manners of these Romish Votaries; and we shall find in *Speed*'s History of *Great Britain*, a Catalogue of vicious Celibate persons there found out, their Names and Crimes. In *Battle-Abby* fifteen Sodomites. In *Canterbury* eight Sodomites, and one that kept three Whores. In *Chichester* two Sodomites, in the Cathedral Church one that kept thirteen Whores. In *Windsor*-Castle twenty five Whores were kept amongst them. In *Shulbred*-Monastery nineteen Whores were kept. In *Bristol* the Abbot kept four Whores. In *Mayden-Bradly* the Prior kept five Whores. In *Bathe*-Monastery one had seven Whores, and was a Sodomite. In *Abingdon*-Monastery the Abbot had three Whores, and two Children by his own Sister. In *Bermondsey*-Monastery *John White* Prior, called the Bull of *Bermondsey*, had twenty Whores. *Fuller* in his History of Abbies doth relate this story: *One Sir* Henry Colt *of* Neither-Hall *in* Essex, *much in favour with King* Henry *the Eighth for his merry conceits, suddenly took leave of the King late at night, promising to wait upon his Grace early the next morning. Hence he hastned to* Waltham-Abby, *being informed by his Letters that the Monks thereof would return in the night from* Chesthunt-Nunery, *where they had secretly quartered themselves; Sir* Henry *pitcht a Brick-stall (wherewith he used to take Deer in the Forrest) in the narrowest place of the Marsh, where they were to pass over, leaving some of his Confederates to manage the same. The Monks coming out of the Nunery, and hearing a noise made behind them, and suspecting to be discovered, put out the light which they had with them, whose feet without eyes could find the way home in so used a path; making more haste than good speed, they ran themselves all into the Net: The next morning Sir* Henry Colt *brought and presented them to King* Henry, *who often had seen sweeter, but never fatter Venison.* I might add many more instances had I room and time; but I list not any longer to rake in this Dunghill, being wearied my self in the search, I shall draw towards a conclusion, fearing lest I should trespass upon both the patience and modesty of my Reader. If my Subject did not naturally lead unto this discourse concerning the lewdness and wickedness of these Celibate persons,

ſons, and if I did not apprehend that ſuch diſcourſe might be of uſe, I would have paſſed by theſe things in ſilence.

Uſe 2. What hath been ſaid concerning the wickedneſs of the Church of *Rome*, occaſioned by this forbidding to marry, I hope may be a ſufficient caution unto all of you to take heed, and move you to abhor both the principles and practices of this corrupt Church. Indeed if any of your hearts be ſet upon filthy luſts; and the moſt abominable uncleanneſſes, and your Conſciences are ready under our Reformed Religion to moleſt and trouble you too much, ſo that you cannot without ſecret laſhes and ſtings within proſecute your hearts deſires, and gratifie your vile affections: If you have a mind like Swine to wallow in the mire of the moſt naſty filthineſs, and to get Indulgencies for ſuch practices, I would adviſe you to turn Papiſts, I know no better way that you can take to ſear and cauterize your Conſciences, that you may ſin with the leaſt controul. And you of the Female Sex, if you deſire more ſecretly to be naught, and to vail all with a Religious Cloak, you may acquaint your ſelves with the Prieſts and Fathers of this Church, who though they will not marry, yet they will ſtrain hard but they will gratifie ſuch an inclination in you; and to ſtop the mouth of your clamorous Conſciences, they will give you forthwith an Abſolution, yea and admit you unto the Communion. But if you would deny all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts; if you would live ſoberly, righteouſly and godly in the World, as the Word of God, and Grace of the Goſpel doth teach; if you deſire to be ſanctified here, and ſaved hereafter, abhor Popery, come not near the Tents of this wicked Church, leſt you periſh with them in the ruine which the Lord will certainly bring upon them. Drink not of the Cup of Fornication which the Whore of *Babylon* would put into your hands; Receive not the Mark of this Beaſt upon your foreheads: Read and conſider one Scripture, which ſpeaketh of thoſe which turn Papiſts, ſufficient to affrighten all from admitting and embracing this Religion by the fearful conſequences thereof; the place is, *Rev.* 14. 9, 10, 11, 12. *And the third Angel followed them, ſaying with a loud voice, If any man worſhip the Beaſt and his Image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the ſame ſhall drink of the Wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the Cup of his Indignation, and he ſhall be tormented with fire and brimſtone in the preſence of the holy Angels, and in the preſence of the Lamb; And the ſmoak of their torment aſcendeth up for ever and ever: And they have no reſt day nor night who worſhip the Beaſt and his Image, and whoſoever receiveth the mark of his Name.*

Uſe 3. Laſtly, you that are married Miniſters, and live with your Wives in holy Wedlock according to God's Ordinance; Value not the Popiſh Doctrine or Decrees which forbiddeth your Marriage: So long as God is for it, no matter who they be that are againſt it; ſo long as God's Word doth allow it, no matter though the Pope doth forbid it.

Only,

Only let it be your endeavour to put to silence the ignorance and perverseness of foolish men, by being blameless, as well as each the Husbands of one Wife: Above all others, you that are Ministers, and have Wives, should be as if you had none in regard of all inordinacy of affection towards them; and let it appear unto all, that although married, you chiefly care for the things that belong to the Lord, how you may please the Lord. You need not care, or be concerned at the barkings of the impure Papists, like Dogs who bark at the Moon, so long as your Conversations do shine.

SER-

SERMON XVIII.

The Nature, Possibility, and Duty, of a true Believer attaining to a certain Knowledge of his Effectual Vocation, Eternal Election, and final Perseverance to Glory.

2 Peter 1. 10. *Wherefore the rather, Brethren, give all diligence to make your Calling and Election sure: for if you do these things, you shall never fall.*

THat I may the more effectually discharge the Duty incumbent on me, and the more fully confute that *pernicious* Errour of the Church of *Rome*; which hath declared, *That a Believers assurance of the pardon of his sin, is a vain and ungodly confidence:* It being (say they) impossible for any person to know that he is *now pardoned*, much less that he shall *continue* and *persevere* in the state of Grace; I have made choice of this portion of Scripture, as the Foundation of my present Discourse. Wherein it *must* be considered, that although *Controversial* and *Polemical* Treatises are usually *large* and *full*, yet the *few moments* allowed for our present delivery, and the *few Pages* allotted for the printing of this Discourse, necessitates me to manage things in a very contracted manner: So, as I must give you but only *hints* of some *Arguments on our side*, and also must *rather obviate* and *prevent*, than *formally answer* all our Adversaries *Objections*. Avoiding all unnecessary Amplifications, and popular Illustrations, which might make our stile more smooth and pleasant, I shall only deliver what may rationally convince *your Judgment*; leaving the exciting of your *Affections* to the more immediate Influence of the good Spirit of God.

Conc Trid. Sess. 6. Certitudo remissionis peccatorum est vana & omni pietate remota fiducia. Bellar. de Just. lib. 3. cap. 3. Primus Hæreticorum error est posse Fideles eam notitiam habere de sua gratia ut certa Fide statu aut sibi remissa esse peccata.

Briefly then, the words I have read are an earnest Exhortation to an excellent Duty. *The scope and division of the words.*

In which Exhortation, it will be very much to our purpose to consider: 1. The *Person* that gives the Exhortation: 2. The *Persons* to whom it is given: 3. The *Matter* exhorted to: 4. The *Motives* inforcing.

1. *The person exhorting,* Peter.

The Person that gives the Exhortation, is the Apostle *Peter*, one eminent, 1. For his frequent Temptations: 2. For his great falls by these Temptations: 3. For recovery after those falls.

1. *One much tempted.*

1. *Peter* was a person subject to frequent and violent Temptations unto sin; at one time the Devil had so transformed himself into *an Angel of light*, that he had almost thereby transformed *Peter* into *an Angel of darkness*: *Peter* thought he acted the part of a *Saint* and Friend to dissuade Christ from going to *Jerusalem*; but Christ intimates that *Peter* acted therein the part of a *Devil*, when he said to him, Get thee behind me, *Satan:* at another time, the Devil desired to *winnow Peter as wheat*, and you know how he was sifted in the High Priest's Hall.

Matth 16.23.

Luke 22. 31.

2. *One foully falling by temptation.*

Gal. 2. 12, 13.

In this we deny not but that the Pope may be Peter's *Successor.*

Peter was one that being tempted, had greatly miscarried, and fain into gross sin; for you do not only read of his *dissembling*, and of his too great complying with the superstitious Jews in their Ceremonies and Worship, but appearing like a down-right Apostate renouncing of Christ, and forswearing any knowledge of him, *Matth.* 26. 24. He that shall consider the experience which *Peter* had of *Satan's power* and *subtilty*, and of his own *impotency* and *weakness*, (both which Considerations might afford Arguments against the possibility of Assurance) may at first wonder that *Peter* should ever attain to any Assurance himself; much more that he should be the Author of such an Exhortation as this to others.

3. *One recovered from temptation by Christ's intercession, and the Spirit's efficacy.*

Luke 22. 32.

But *Peter* (as he had experience of Satan's malice, of his own insufficiency, so he) had experience, 1. Of the *prevalency* of his Saviour's intercession: Christ had prayed that *Peter's Faith might not fail* in the habit, although it did fail in the act. 2. He had experience of the Spirit's efficacy in working true sorrow and repentance for his great sin; and hence (in part) it is, that *Peter* is most fit of all men to encourage weak Believers against their despairing and desponding fears, and to put them upon endeavours after Assurance: moreover, *Peter* had received a Command from Christ, that when he should be converted, (*i. e.* recovered from his partial Apostacy) he should endeavour to strengthen his Brethren, and probably 'tis in obedience to this Command of Christ that he is thus earnest in this Exhortation.

Ibid.

2. *The persons exhorted, true Believers.*

The *Persons* to whom the Exhortation is given, are called in the Text *Brethren*; by which Title is not only expressed every true Believers *Dignity*, who is a Brother to the very Apostles themselves, (which Fraternity is infinitely more desirable than that Bastard Nepotism which some Romish Cardinals boast of) but also by this Compellation the *truth* of their Graces is declared. For the Apostle had before described them to be, 1. Such as had obtained *like pretious Faith* with himself. 2. Such as were indued with *saving Knowledge*. 3. Such to whom God had communicated *all things pertaining to life and godliness*.

Vers. 1.
Vers. 2.
Vers. 3.
Vers. 4.

4. Such

4. Such as God had *called to glory and virtue.* 5. Such to whom God had given exceeding great *pretious promiſes.* 6. Such as were made partakers of *the Divine Nature.* Laſtly, Such as had eſcaped *the pollutions of the world through luſt.* Verſ. 5.

Theſe are the perſons who although they had obtained *pretious Faith*, yet had not attained *certain knowledge* of their own ſpiritual ſtate, but were in a *poſſibility*, yea in a very great *preparation* thereunto.

It is an abominable falſhood which *Bellarmine* boldly reports that we teach, that except men have Aſſurance, they are not true Believers, or ſhall they ever be ſaved: This is an impudent calumny: for if any particular perſons *abroad* have thought that a ſpecial and full perſwaſion of pardon of their ſin, was of the eſſence of Faith, let them anſwer for it; our Divines *at home* generally are of another Judgment: Biſhop *Davenant* and Biſhop *Prideaux*, and others, have ſhewn the great difference between *Fides* and *Fiducia*, between Recumbence and Aſſurance; and they all do *account* and *call* Aſſurance a *Daughter*, *Fruit* and *Conſequent* of Faith; and the late learned *Arrowſmith* tells us, that God ſeldom beſtows Aſſurance upon Believers till they are grown in Grace; for (ſaith he) there is the ſame difference between Faith of *Recumbence*, and Faith of *Aſſurance*, as is between *Reaſon* and *Learning*. Reaſon is the Foundation of Learning, ſo as there can be no Learning if Reaſon be wanting, (as in Beaſts) in like manner there can be *no Aſſurance* where there is *no Faith* of adherence. Again, as *Reaſon* well exerciſed in the ſtudy of Arts and Sciences ariſes *to Learning*; ſo Faith being well exerciſed on its *proper Object*, and by its *proper Fruits*, ariſes to Aſſurance. Further, as by negligence, non-attendance, or ſome violent Diſeaſe, Learning may *be loſt*, while Reaſon doth *abide*; ſo by temptation, or by ſpiritual ſloth, *Aſſurance* may be loſt, while *ſaving Faith* may abide. Laſtly, as all men are *rational*, but all men are not *learned*; ſo all *regenerate* perſons have Faith to comply ſavingly with the Goſpel-method of Salvation, but all true Believers have not Aſſurance. Bell. de Juſt. lib. 3. cap. 3. Davenant de Cer. 37. Prideaux Cer. Sept. Tact. Sac. l. 2.

The Believers in the Text were in a ſtate of Salvation, but wanted Aſſurance: hence, 3. The Apoſtle puts them upon *diligence* to attain it; which acquaints us with the matter exhorted to: where obſerve, 1. The matter *ultimately intended*, *viz.* The making of their calling and election ſure. 2. The means *ſubſerviently directed to*, *viz.* The giving diligence to attain it. 3. The order of directing their diligence, *firſt*, to make their calling, and *ſecondly*, their election ſure; for no man knows any thing of his election *further* than he is aſſured of his being effectually called. 3. *The matter of Exhortation.*

4. The fourth and laſt part of the Text affords us the *Motives* by which the Exhortation is enforced, which are, 1. Either implyed in theſe words, *Wherefore the rather*; and if you look back upon the two next preceding Verſes, you will find in them a double Argument, 1. *Ab utili,* 4. *The Motives:* 1. *Implyed.*

Vers. 8. *utili*, from the fruitfulness that accompany Assurance, *If these things be in you and abound, they make you that you shall not be barren or unfruitful in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus.* 2. *Ab incommodo*, from a double danger, 1. Of growing more and more *ignorant* of Spiritual Truths. Mat. 4. He that lacketh these things is blind, (the word signifies purblind) purblind persons do *see*, but they see *only things near at hand:* many true Believers are weak Believers; not so strong-sighted as *Abraham* was, Joh. 8. 56. that could see *Christ's day afar off:* unassured persons are not able to Vers. 9. look steadily to those things that are to come. 2. There is danger of more frequent falling into actual sin: For although God will not suffer them to fall into any habitual *custom* of sin; yet they are very *apt* to forget that they were purged from their old sin, and so are so much the 2 Pet. 2. 22. more ready to *return with the Dog to the vomit, and the Swine that was washed to the wallowing in the mire:* not that any truly regenerate person doth so; *but*, there is a *moral tendency* in spiritual *sloth* and *laziness* to procure such *Apostacy*; 2. which is farther also *intimated* in this 10 Verse, 2. *Motive expressed.* where you have the *Motive expressed* in the Text it self, *If you do these things, ye shall never fall:* that is, live *you* in a diligent exercise of saving Faith till you come to Assurance, and *God* will make good his own 1 Pet. 1. 5. promise, that you *shall be kept by the power of God through faith unto Salvation*; Perseverance being *designed, decreed* and *promised* by God in the behalf of all those that he hath effectually *called*, and did eternally *elect*.

Stabilis est Dei gratia qua fulciuntur ergo immunes sunt a periculo cadendi. Cal. in Loc.

The words thus opened, afford us these two general Propositions.

The first general Proposition. That it is the priviledge of a *true* Believer, that it is *possible* for him to make his *calling* sure for *present*, and thereby to become assured of his *election past*, and consequently of his *perseverance* unto glory *to come*.

The second general Proposition. That it is a Believers *duty* to give all *diligence* to make his present calling, past election, and future perseverance *sure*.

The first *general* Proposition doth branch it self into three *special* Propositions.

1. That 'tis possible for a true Believer to make his calling sure. 2. 'Tis possible *thereby* to know he was *elected*. 3. And by both to become assured that he shall *persevere* unto Glory.

The first special Proposition. I begin with the first special Proposition, That 'tis possible for a Believer to make his calling sure: Here 'tis necessary that two things be *undertaken* and *performed*: 1. Explication: 2. Probation.

Explication. Two things are to be opened: 1. What is understood by our *calling*: 2. What is meant by a *sure* calling.

1. what is an effectual call. *Quest.* 1. What is to be understood by our calling?

Answ. Calling *strictly* taken is an act of a person declaring his desire of

of another persons approach and access to him: Thus the *Centurion* tells Christ, that he could say to one Servant, *Come*, and he *cometh*; and thus Christ bids the *Samaritan*-woman *call* her Husband, and *come* to him. But the word more *largely* taken, is used for *any* declaration of the *will* of *one* person to *another*, where *compliance* with that will is *required*. Thus 'tis said, that *Jacob called* his Son *Joseph*, when he declared his will to him, saying, *Bury me not in Egypt, and he made him swear:* and in this large sence God is said to call a Sinner, when he *reveals* his own *will*, and a Sinners *duty*; as when God calls him to repentance, to faith, to holiness, 'tis the work of *God* to make known his pleasure, and 'tis the duty of *men* to comply therewith.

Luke 7. 7. John 4. 16. Gen. 47. 29.

The word here *our calling*, is *nomen participiale*, and 'tis taken not *actively* for our calling upon God, as when 'tis sometimes put for all that worship which we perform to God, as in that phrase, *Then began men to call upon God:* but 'tis taken passively for God's *calling of us*, the nature of which act is fully expressed, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13, 14. *But we are bound to give thanks unto God always for you, Brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath chosen you from the beginning to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth whereunto you were called by our Gospel to the obtaining of the glory of the Lord Jesus.* That which I would have you observe at present from hence, is this, that the *preaching* of the *Gospel*, and the revelation of God's will therein, is *God's call:* so the Apostle saith, Ye were called by our Gospel, *i. e.* our preaching of the Gospel. But here we must distinguish that the call of God in the Gospel is two-fold: 1. In word *only:* 2. In word and power *conjoined*; so *Paul* distinguishes in 1 *Thess.* 1. 5. *Our Gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and in the holy Ghost, and in much assurance.* Now according to the different means which God uses in calling, so there follows a *different fruit*, success, or consequent of God's calling.

Gen. 4. 26. 1 Cor. 1. 2.

God's Call of two kinds.
1. *In word only.*
2. *In word and power both.*

Hence it comes to pass, that God's call sometimes is ineffectual, and sometimes effectual; so the same Apostle plainly declares in 1 *Thess.* 2. 13. *For this cause thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the Word of God, which effectually worketh in you that believe.* Observe hence, that 'tis the *work* of God's Spirit in the heart, superadded to the *Word* of the Gospel, as spoken by men; that makes any call *effectual:* without this inward work, God may call, and the Soul will never answer. But when the Spirit co-operates with the Word, the Souls of the Elect become obedient unto God's call; *they so hear his voice as to live*; there is then an enlivening, yea, a creating power appearing therein. I grant there is a sort of men arising among us, that scoff at this great work of Regeneration, and deny the infusion of principles or habits of Grace; but we have not to do with these men (at this time) who have totally fain from the Faith, and are

Hence ineffectual, or effectual.

Prov. 1. 23. Joh. 5.

greater

greater enemies to the Croſs of Chriſt than the Papiſts themſelves. Sure I am, that *Thomas Aquinas*, that famous perſon whom the Church of *Rome* have Canonized for a Saint, tells us, that ſince there are ſome men indued with ſuch habits which cannot be attained by the power of Nature, (becauſe by them ſome men are fitted for the end of Salvation) therefore 'tis neceſſary that God be owned as the immediate Infuſer of theſe habits. And he further adds, that as God produces ſome natural effects *without the help* of ſecond cauſes, (as health is ſometimes beſtowed without the help of Phyſick) ſo God infuſes habits of Grace *without* and *beyond* the power of *Nature*. And whereas this learned perſon foreſaw that ſome men might here object, that God's infuſion of theſe habits into *ſome* perſons and not into *others*, doth plainly prove *diſcriminating* Grace; (which Doctrine of late hath been denied and derided by the Socinians and ſome others) therefore this Angelical Doctor makes his Confeſſion *plainly*, that *he for his part* doth own *diſcriminating* Grace; and that he doth firmly believe, that God (agreeable to his own wiſdom, and for reaſons reſerved to himſelf) beſtows more Grace on ſome, than upon others: And that though it be moſt agreeable unto Man's nature, that *habits* ſhould ariſe from frequent *acts*, and much exerciſe, yet God *may*, and *doth work ſuch habits of Grace* in ſome Men, which Nature cannot work; and therefore he concludes that they are ſupernaturally produced. I have given you the opinion of *this Author* about an effectual call the more *fully*, becauſe I am confident, that had ſome men (who oppoſe the infuſion of habits) been *old* enough, or *diligent* enough to have peruſed the Writings of ſuch a perſon as *Thomas Aquinas*, before they had divulged their own fond Notions and Opinions, they would (out of a kind of ambition to be accounted ὁμοίους, like-minded with ſuch learned men) not have made ſuch an open ſcoff and deriſion of diſcriminating and effectual Grace; wherein they do not only contradict the expreſs words of holy Writ, but alſo oppoſe the Doctrine of the moſt learned of the Fathers and Schoolmen, and that with a moſt bold, as well as blind confidence.

The Judgment of T. Aquinas *about infuſed habits of Grace.* 1. 1. Q. 51. Ar. 4. 1. Q. 12. Ar. 4. 1. Q. 12. Ar. 4. Non iniquus eſt Deus ſi inæqualia æqualibus præparat.

Chryſoſtom, Auguſtine, Bernard. *See* Catharinus *and* Eiſengrenius de certitu. Gratiæ.

I muſt beg pardon for this ſhort (but neceſſary) digreſſion, becauſe 'tis this effectual work of God's Spirit in regenerating the Soul by *infuſing of habits of Grace*, which diſtinguiſhes an internal effectual call of God, from a meer external and ineffectual one; and this is the thing which is chiefly intended in the Text, to be made *ſure*, *viz.*

That it might be known whether or no God hath ſo called thee by his Word, as that alſo he hath wrought in thee by his Spirit; whether God hath illuminated thy underſtanding, and inclined thy will, ſo as thou haſt complyed with God's will, and haſt anſwered his call; whether when God *did draw thee*, *thou didſt run after him*; whether when God did *knock at the door of thy heart*, *thou didſt open to him*; whether when *God did intreat and perſwade thee to be reconciled to him*, thou didſt conſent; whether when he did woo thee, he did alſo win thee; whether

Can. 1. 4. Rev. 3. 20. 2 Cor. 5. 20.

whether when he invited thee to the *Wedding-Supper of his Son*, thou didst make *no excuse* or delay, but didst accept, and welcome, the offer of the Gospel with faith and love: all which if thou didst do, it did arise from the power of an inward call, being superadded to the outward call of the Word; the very *essence* of an effectual call consisting in the Spirit's regenerating the Soul, and giving a new heart, (which is Scripture-Language) or in the Spirit's infusing of new principles and habits of Grace, (according to the phrase of the Schools) so that now *by calling* here in the Text, you must *understand* an inward effectual change wrought in the heart by God himself in the work of *Conversion* and *Regeneration*, or the Spirits infusing of habits of Grace into thy heart. Luk. 14. 18. 2 Pet. 1. 4.

Quest. 2. What is meant by *sure* calling, or *wherein* consists the nature of Assurance? 2. *What is meant by sure calling.*

Answ. There is a *double* certainty of an effectual calling: 1. One, the certainty of it *in it self:* 2. The other, the certainty of it *unto us.* Certitudo duplex objecti vel subjecti rei vel spei.

1. Our calling is sure in it self, so soon as ever God hath effectually called us, *whether we know it, or know it not:* God may effectually call, and we may have surely answered God's call, and yet we may not be sure that God hath so called us, or that we have so answered; but yet our calling hereby is made *sure in it self*; and this the Schools call, *Certitudo Objecti*, the certainty of the *Objecti*.

2. Our calling is sure unto us, when we know that God hath effectually called us; and this the Schoolmen call, *Certitudo Subjecti*, the certainty of the *Subject:* the word in the Text signifies *firm, stable, steady*, and *fixed*, and sure; either, 1. as a *Building* is sure that hath a good Foundation; 2. or as a *Conclusion* is sure that is drawn from certain Premises: in like manner our calling may be said to *be sure*, 1. either when it hath the efficacy of God's Spirit as its sure Foundation; or, 2. when it hath the evidence of proper fruits, which are as good Premises or sure Arguments, from which we may conclude our selves to be effectually called. Βεβαίαν. *Thus* Plato *in* Tim. *saith, that God is both* Βεβαίως ὤν, *the most firm being, and* Βεβαίως γνώστης, *the most known being.*

That the Text hath respect both to *Subjective* as well as *Objective* certainty, is beyond all dispute with considerative men: for the persons here exhorted (as I have shewn) were true Believers, and consequently their calling was sure in it self before the Exhortation was here given to them to make it sure; and therefore the Exhortation must *chiefly* respect *subjective certainty*, as something to be *superadded* to objective certainty. Hence when *Bellarmine* would (from this Text) prove Justification by works, because in some Copies the words are read thus, Give diligence to make your calling sure δι' ἔργων ἴσην, by good works; the most learned *Chamier* answers him, That granting the words be so read, (*Beza* owning that he had seen such a Copy) yet 'tis very *absurd* and *illogical* for *Bellarmine* to argue that mens *persons* are therefore justified Chamier Paustrat. Tom. 3. Lib. 15 cap. 15.

justified by good works, *In Foro Divino*, (as the Jesuite doth contend) because (according to this Text) *mens calling* may be *justified* or made sure by good works *In Foro Conscientiæ*: for this there is no colour from these words, because when *Vocation* is said here to be made sure by good works, 'tis (saith *Chamier*) to be understood *primarily* and *properly* of subjective certainty; *ut constet esse efficacem, & ut ejus certitudo ostendatur signo proprio nempe bonis operibus*, that it may appear to be effectual, and its certainty may be manifested by its proper signs, namely, by good works, and in *that* sense we also own that men may be *justified* by works, *i. e. declared* so in Conscience: but by a sure calling in the Text, is chiefly to be understood a calling assuredly known by the subject to be an effectual and saving calling. See *Beza* and *Calvin* on the place.

Subjective certainty is of two kinds.
1. *Perfect.*
2. *Imperfect.*

Now this subjective certainty is two-fold: 1. Perfect: 2. Imperfect. *Perfect* subjective certainty is when a thing is *so* known, as it cannot be *better* known; or when the subject is so certain of the truth of a thing, as that he cannot be more certain of it, because he hath not the *least ignorance* of the thing, or the *least doubt* concerning it: this is perfect certainty. But here are three things to be noted: Let it be considered,

Note 1. There is no perfect certainty amongst men.
1 Cor. 13 9.

1. There is *no such thing* as this perfect subjective certainty *in this world*, perfect certainty is only to be found in perfect men, and 'tis folly to say any men are perfect, or that there is any such thing as *perfect knowledge in this world:* The Apostle saith, *We know but in part*, and therefore it is impossible that we should be certain any more but in part, that is, *imperfectly certain.*

Note 2. Some imperfect certainty is proper certainty.
Job 11. 7.

2. Another thing which I would have our Adversaries consider, is, that imperfect certainty, though imperfect, yet it may be *true and proper certainty*, and is in many cases to be accounted more than *conjectural* or meer opinionative knowledge. For instance, we are told by God himself, *that no man can find out the Almighty to perfection*; and the most holy men in the world have some Atheism remaining in them; yet I hope many men have a *true and certain knowledge* of God, although no man hath a perfect knowledge of him: so a man may have a *true* and *certain* knowledge that he is effectually called, although he hath not a *perfect* knowledge of it.

3. Imperfect certainty hath these four properties.

3. Let it be considered, that the nature of imperfect subjective certainty, is always such a knowledge as hath these four properties: 1. 'Tis built upon, or drawn from most *certain proofs and evidences*; and therefore, 2. It is such as doth prevail against all irrational doubts; and, 3. It is accompanied or followed with proper fruits of undoubted certainty, (notwithstanding a *mixture* of *ignorance*, and some *impressed or indiscoursive fears* which may consist with it:) 4. 'Tis such as God doth own for true and proper assurance in holy Writ.

1. Found upon assuring evidences.

1. When knowledge is built upon rational *assuring evidences*, then it ought to be accounted certain knowledge, *notwithstanding* some *irrational* and *unaccountable* doubts may arise. A man that walks upon the

Leads

heads of a very high, but very strong well-built Tower, incompassed with Battlements, doth know *rationally* that he cannot fall; (and he is not rationally in any fear of falling) but yet when he looks from that heighth, he hath *irrational* fears impressed upon him; and yet such fears as these hinder not, but that he is *still* certain that he shall not fall, because he can rationally prove that he *cannot* fall: Thus a person assured of his effectual calling by good evidence, is *really* and *properly* certain; although possibly when he looks down from the *heighth* of future expected Glory, into the *Bottomless-Pit* of misery, (from whence he hath escaped) some indiscoursive or irrational fears and doubts may be impressed upon him, which may *lessen*, but not *destroy* assurance.

2. When assurance is actually stronger than diffidence, and doth certainly prevail against distracting fears, then it is to be accounted certain assurance, though it be still *imperfect*: the truth, and the degree of a Believers assurance, doth hold *proportion* to the truth and degree of his Grace; and by this proportion of one to the other, they do very much illustrate each other. Thus, first, there is an analogy between Grace and Assurance, in this, that as Grace may be *true*, although it be not *perfect*; so may Assurance be *true* Assurance when *imperfect*. Again, as where *Sin reigns*, there is *no* Grace; so where *Doubting reigns*, there is *no* Assurance: but as when Grace *prevails*, 'tis accounted true Grace; so when Assurance prevails over Doubts, 'tis to be reckoned true Assurance. *Lastly*, where Grace is perfect without Sin, (as in Heaven) there Assurance will be perfect without all doubt, and not till then. 2. *Prevailing over all rational doubts.*

3. When a true Believers imperfect assurance is accompanied with the *proper fruits* of true assurance, 'tis then true assurance. Such fruits as these: 1. *Inward peace and satisfaction of mind*, the feast of a good Conscience. 2. *Joy in the Holy Ghost*. 3. Power and strength over temptations. 4. *Victory over the World*. 5. Inlargedness of heart *in the love of God*. 6. *Delight* in his ways. 7. Ready obedience to his will. 8. Patient bearing of the Cross, and *rejoycing in tribulation*. 9. Freedom and *boldness of access to the Throne of Grace*. 10. A *Spirit of Grace and Supplication*. 11. *Dependance upon God in all states*. 12. Great expectations from him. 13. All willingness to go hence, *and a desire to be dissolved*. When assurance is accompanied or followed with such fruits as these, (and the assurance of many a Believer is thus attended) although it be not perfect, yet it is true and proper assurance. 3. *Followed with the proper fruits of assurance.* Phil.4.7. Gal.5.22. 1 Joh.5.4. 2 Cor.5.14. Psal.40.8. Job 1.21. Jam.1.2. Heb.4.16. Gal.4.6. Zac.12.10. Psal.62.8. Phil.1.23.

4. That assurance *which God himself owns* as true and proper assurance, and is *called so* by the Spirit of God in Scripture, is to be acknowledged *by us as such*. God hath given *divers names* to a Believers assurance, which speaks it properly *to be so*. 1. 'Tis called πληροφορια, a *sure perswasion*; *St.* Paul *saith*, *that he was perswaded that neither life nor death*, &c. *should separate him from the love of God*, Rom.8.38. 2. 'Tis 4. *Owned by God, and so called.*

called γνῶσις, certain *knowledge*: St. *John* saith, *Hereby we know that we are in him*, 1 John 1. 5. 3. Ἔλεγχος, an *evident probation*; so a Believers *faith is called the evident proof of things not seen*, Heb. 11. 1. 4. Ὑπόστασις, a substantial prepossession of Heaven; so Faith is also called by the same Apostle in the same place. 5. 'Tis called πληροφορία, a fulness of assurance both in *Heb.* 6. 11. and *Heb.* 10. 20. 1 *Thess.* 1. 5. A Believers assurance is owned by God, and said to be full, although not perfect. So that the Controversie between us and *Rome* is not,

Our Controversie with Rome *in this point is about the proper, not the perfect assurance of a Believer.*

1. Whether *perfect* assurance be possible, but whether *certain* assurance be possible; that is, whether a *well-grounded*, *prevalent* and *influential* assurance be not attainable. *Bellarmine* grants Believers may have a conjectural hope; we say true Believers may attain to proper assurance: Theirs grant an assurance of fancy; we contend for an assurance of faith: They is an assurance of opinion; ours an assurance of knowledge. I confess the Philosophick Schools have divided all Argumentation into *Demonstrative* and *Opinionative*, and they divided all knowledge into perfect science, or meer conjecture; and hence arose two sorts of Philosophers amongst them: 1. The Δογμάτικοι, Dogmatists, who thought themselves *perfectly certain of every thing*, and doubted of nothing, but were as infallible as the Pope in his Chair. 2. The Ἐφεκτικοι, a kind of seekers that did restrain their assent, and *doubted of all things*; like the Popish Laity that are kept in the *dark*, and are *taught* to be blind: but the Protestants are of *an elective kind of Divines*, who know a *middle* way between both extreams, and therefore we do maintain a possibility of certain knowledge, while we own an imperfection also; there being various *degrees* of a Believers certainty, and of his assurance, and yet the lowest of them is more than moral conjecture or opinion. *Bellarmine* himself is forced to grant that there are three degrees of certainty; and although he doth not admit a true Believers knowledge of his effectual call into any of those degrees: yet I shall prove anon that a Believer may attain a very high degree of certainty therein.

In certitudine tres quasi gradus distinguuntur, &c. Bellarm. lib. de Just. 3. cap. 2.

2. *Our Controversie not about words or names.*

2. But let it be observed in the second place, that our Controversie is not about words or names of things: the Question is not, Whether a Believers assurance is to be called *certitudo fidei*, or *certitudo fiduciæ*, or *certitudo scientiæ*; whether an assurance of faith, or an assurance of confidence, or an assurance of sense or of knowledge, for indeed it is not properly any of these; but an assurance mixed, and arising partly from faith, partly from confidence, and partly from knowledge both of reason and sense.

Justi securitas leonis instar dum quoslibet contra se Insurgere conspicit, ad mentis suæ confidentiam redit, & scit quod cum eos adversantes superet, &c. Greg. l. 31. Moral. cap. 23.

1. It may be called an *assurance* of confidence, in as much as the degree of an assured Believers faith and knowledge must be such as excludes all rational and *prevailing* fears and doubts, according as I have already shewn.

2. It may be called an *assurance of faith*, from that special interest that

that faith hath therein, in as much as no Believer can attain to assurance of Salvation, that doth not first *Fiducially* and by way of Application believe those *peculiar* Declarations of God's Grace and will in the Gospel, which are the *Foundation* of a Believers Salvation and Assurance; more especially these three, 1. The *way* of Salvation by Christ. 2. The nature and *properties* of saving Faith. 3. The certain *perseverance* of true Believers to glory.

2. 'Tis called an assurance of Faith, in as much as there must be an *actual complyance* with the way of Salvation by an explicite exercise of saving Faith upon Christ Jesus; a Believer demeaning himself towards Christ, as towards the *Mediator* of the New Covenant.

3. It may be called an assurance of knowledge, in as much as every assured Believer must first know what are the signs of true Faith, and secondly, must know assuredly that the signs of true Faith are in himself.

4. It may be called an assurance of sense, in as much as a Believer knows not only by way of rational proof, but also by way of spiritual, internal, and experimental sense, that the work of God's Spirit hath been effectual in a saving manner upon him: All which I shall verifie and make good by several Arguments, in the order and method following.

2. *Probation.*

For proof of this first Proposition, I shall first argue from the *Confessions* of our Adversaries, that is, from some *special Articles of their Doctrine*, which (although we do not grant them to be true in themselves, yet they) do afford sufficient Argument for *Conviction of a Papist* in our present case; evincing that it is possible for a Believer to attain to assurance of his being effectually called.

1. *Arg. from the Confessions and Articles of the Church of* Rome.

The first Doctrine of theirs which we shall take notice of, is this; They *grant and affirm* that a Believer may be assured of the pardon of his sins, by *extraordinary means*, by some *immediate* revelation, *i. e.* either by a voice from Heaven, or the Mission of an *Angel* sent from thence; but they deny it to be possible to know this by *ordinary* means, *i. e.* by the revelation of *God's will*, and of *man's duty* in Scripture, with reference to eternal life, although the *Mind* of man be savingly illuminated by the Spirit, and although *Conscience* be enabled thereby to compare a Believers heart and life with the Rule of the Word. Now I would fain know how St. *Anthony*, St. *Galla*, or St. *Francis*, (who (*Bellarmine* saith) were extraordinarily assured) could be *so well* assured by a voice supposed to come from *Heaven*, (which may be subject to many delusions of phansie, and to divers cheats and impostures by Men or Devils, especially when heard by one simple person only) as by the voice of *Christ Jesus*, who was sent of God to reveal the Rule of life, and by the voice of a *man's own Conscience*, assisted by the Spirit enabling a Believer to discern his agreement with that Rule. I *grant*, that God gave testimony unto Christ Jesus *by a voice from Heaven*: but

1. *Popish Doctrine, that assurance is possible in an extraordinary way, but not in an ordinary way.* *See* Bell. lib. 3. Just. cap. 5.

Matth. 3. 17. Luke 3. 22. Joh. 12. 28. observe, 1. This voice was frequently repeated: 2. It was given in the hearing of multitudes: 3. God did speak *nothing* from Heaven immediately, but *what* he had *tanta mount*, spoken before in the Scripture.

Joh. 5. 39. Hence it is that Christ appeals not to this voice, but bids men *search the Scriptures, for they testified of him*; and when Christ tells his followers

Joh. 5. 36. again, that God had given testimony of him, *he makes mention of the works* that the Father had enabled him to do, but makes no mention of his voice.

And as for assurance *given by Angels*, it must needs fall short of the assurance *given by the Spirit of God:* for the Apostle supposes that an

Gal. 1. 8. Angel from Heaven *(i. e. Satan transforming himself into an Angel of light)* may preach false Doctrine, and be *accursed*; which is blasphemy to suppose of the Holy Spirit. Hence also our Saviour intimates in

Luke 16. 29. the Parable of *Dives*, that *the Writings of Moses and the Prophets* in Scripture, are much more convincing and assuring, than the words of *one arising from the dead*, or one sent from Heaven. If men may then be assured in *Bellarmine*'s extraordinary way, they may much better be assured by the ordinary way revealed in Scriptures.

2 *Popish Doctr. That one man may be assured of anothers Salvation, but not of his own.* Marcellinus Cervinus.

The second Popish Doctrine is this, They say that one man may be assured of anothers Salvation, but that no man can be assured of his own: The Pope declares that he was sure of *Bellarmine*'s Salvation *when he Canonized him for a Saint*, but *Bellarmine* was not sure of his own Salvation himself when he died; for his own Nephew relates that he trembled at the thoughts of death; and that when some standing by desired him that he would pray for them in Heaven, he answered, That for his part he knew not (when he was just expiring) *whether ever he should come there.* Now of all sorts of men the Church of *Rome* ought to grant assurance possible to Believers themselves, when as the Pope hath declared himself to be so infallibly sure of the Salvation of so many millions whom he hath Canonized.

3 *Popish Doctr. That the Priest can give assurance by his word, but God cannot do it by his word.*

3. They say that the Priest or Confessor can give assurance by his bare word, but deny God's Word to be any good ground of assurance: *Bellarmine* saith, that after Confession, the Priest *by the word of Absolution* doth give such evidence of justifying Grace, *as there can be no mistake therein*; these are his very words: here he mentions Confession as *a help* to assurance; yet afterwards he makes assurance to depend *wholly on Absolution:* for he saith it may often happen that a man may confess *few or none of his sins*, and yet the *Priest* may *assure him* of pardon, and he ought so to believe. You see here that the Priest can give assurance, and *assurance of faith* also; but with him the Word of God can give *no* assurance at all, much less of faith. The Jesuite will acknowledge that some *dark conjectures* or opinions may be built upon the Word of God, but no assurance; for he boldly, impiously and blasphemously

Confessio pœnitentis & verbum absolventis sunt signa Gratiæ Justificantis practica & efficacia adeo ut falsa esse non possint, Bell. de Pœn. Lib. 1. Cap. 10. Quis aperiat,

Facile potest accidere ut viz. minimam partem suorum criminum & tamen vere absolvitur, & certo absolutus creditur. Bell. de Pœn. Lib. 3. Cap. 12.

saith,

faith, That the certainty of those things that are believed in the Word, is only dark and obscure, like that of opinion: Thus he intimates, as if God could not, but that the Priest could assure: This is as if *Cornelius* should have disbelieved what *Simon Peter* spake to him *in the Name of God*, and should have believed *Simon Magus* whatever he spake in his own or the Devil's Name. Let all men judge whether if the Priest may give assurance by his word, whether God cannot do it by his Word much more infallibly.

Obscura est certitudo earum rerum quæ solo Fide vel opinione Niruntur. Bell. de Just. Lib. 3. Cap. 2.

4. They say men may attain to perfection, and yet not to assurance: the words of *Soto* are these: 'Tis possible for us so in this life to fulfil the whole Law of God, and the Precept of Love, that we may avoid all and every mortal sin; (by mortal sin, he means (as *Luidamus* interprets) whatever may lessen or violate our friendship with God.) Now if men may be thus perfect, certainly then they may know that they are thus perfect, otherwise they could be perfect without perfection; it is therefore a contradiction to say that men may be perfect, and not assured.

4 *Popish Doctr. They say men may attain perfection, yet not assurance.*

5. The Church of *Rome* say that men may attain to works of merit and supererogation: I ask whether works done *ignorantly and without knowledge* of rule or end, can be meritorious? Whatever act is blindly and casually performed, is so far from being a *meritorious* act, as it is not a *moral act* of obedience or service: If then men could perform any work of merit or supererogation, they must know *first* that they are sincere and accepted of God as upright, *before* they can imagine that their works shall be rewarded as meritorious. Yet our Adversaries teach, that men cannot be assured of acceptance, and yet they may not only be perfect, but may be more than perfect, (so supererogation implies) that is, that *they be righteous over much*, or they may be not only *good*, but *too good*, (which we will grant in the proverbial sense) they mean by it, that men may be so righteous and so good, as to purchase pardon for a thousand of *other* sinners, and yet may remain unassured of *their own* pardon. Is not this strange Doctrine? Would you then know the reason why the Church of *Rome* holds these absurd opinions, and seek to maintain that both parts of a contradiction are true as in our *present* case they do, (and I could evidence it by many *more instances*) to satisfie you about this spirit of contradiction, I shall at once open the whole mystery of iniquity, and give you a *Golden Key* whereby you may unlock their more hidden contrivances; a Key of *more worth* than any of those which the Pope holds in his *hand*, or wears at his *girdle*; by which he opens the *Treasures* of all his *inslaved* Vassals at his pleasure: the *print of our Key* you have drawn by the Apostle *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 3, 4, 5. whither I must remit you; *only* let me tell you, that *the more* you *search* into the Romish Religion, the more

5 *Popish Doctr. They say men may merit, and yet not know they are sincere.*

Pietatem quæstum ducunt illi, &c. *Those count gain godliness, who think the Oracles of God are given to no other end but to serve their Avarice, and measure all Religion by their own profit.* Calv. in 1 Tim. 6. 3, 4, 5.

you.

you will *find* it calculated *only for gain.* Assurance is therefore denied by them to be ordinarily possible, because could the *Laity* attain to it without the *extraordinary* assistance *of the Priest*, the price of *Pardons, Indulgencies* and *Absolutions* would exceedingly fall: but although *with them* the Scripture be an *insufficient* thing, yet *Money* assures all things; and at *Rome* you *may buy* (if you be rich enough) not only *assurance*, but *perfection*, and *power of merit*, and *works of supererogation*, and what not? but no more of this.

2 Arg. From the Nature, use and End of the Holy Scripture, which are a good Foundation of assurance.

My second Argument to prove that 'tis possible for a Believer to attain to a certain knowledge that he is effectually called, shall be from the *Nature*, *Use* and *End* of the *Holy Scriptures*: If Scripture be a good *Foundation* of assurance, then assurance is *possible*; but Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance upon a *double account*; 1. As the matter revealed; 2. As to the manner of revelation.

1. As to the matter of them, viz. The Grace of God in Christ.

1. Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance, if you consider the *matter of Scripture-revelation*; the sum and substance of all Scripture-revelation, is *the manifestation of God's Grace in Christ Jesus unto sinners*; *viz.* that *God so loved the world, as that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*, 3 Joh. 16. or in fewer words, *By Grace we are saved through faith, and that not of our selves, 'tis the gift of God*, Ephes. 2. 8. or in one word, *Grace* is the chief matter of Scripture.

Now *God's Grace*, as it is revealed in Scripture, is a good Foundation of assurance *upon two accounts*: 1. As it is *free* Grace: 2. As it is *engaged* Grace.

1. Scripture reveals free Grace.

1. The Scriptures reveal the Grace of God in its *freeness*, and so it affords a good Foundation of assurance: were sinners to be justified by *works*, or by their own *merits*, assurance were *impossible*, but *it is by Grace that we are saved*, i. e. by the merits of our *Mediator*: God freely accepts of that expiation which Christ hath made by the sacrifice of his own bloud upon our account. The *Papists* that hold Justification by works, *must necessarily deny* the possibility of assurance: for if Justification were by works, *then if* a Believer should keep the *whole Law*, and fail but of *one particular*, he were guilty *of all*; in *that case* therefore no man could attain to assurance, for *in many things we offend all.* But blessed be God, Believers are *not under the Law, but under Grace*: Now *Grace* accepts (for Christ's sake) *sincere* obedience, where no *perfect* obedience can be performed. Where-ever sin is neither *deliberate* or *habitual*, it *cannot* weaken a Believer's evidence; neither *ought* the *imperfections* of Believers to hinder their *assurance*, because the Grace of God in Christ is free, accepting satisfaction from Christ.

Jam. 2. 10.

Jam. 3. 2. Rom. 6. 14.

2. Scripture reveals Grace engaged.

2. The Grace of God revealed in Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance *as 'tis engaged Grace*, that is, as it is Grace revealed in a *Covenant* or *Promise*: Grace as to any merit of *ours* is *free*, but as to the *promise* of God it is *engaged*; and as assurance were impossible were not

Grace

Grace *free*, *i. e.* were Believers still under *a Covenant of works*; so assurance were impossible still if Believers were under *no Covenant*-Dispensation at all. Believers could have no hold of Grace, (were it never so free in it self) had not God given us assurance of his Grace in the *Covenant*, and *bound* himself by promise. I know some men do highly magnifie the essential *goodness* and *kindness* of God as the ground of a natural faith. I grant that this Divine benignity and goodness doth afford some lesser *hope* or *expectation* of pardon, but it gives no *solid* ground of assurance. The essential bounty, goodness and mercy of God, is like a *deep* and *wide Ocean*, upon which the mind of man may (as a Vessel at Sea) bear it self up in a *calm*; but if a *storm* arise, every wise Pilot will make towards the shore, or to a *safe Rock*, because 'tis *there* only he can find good *Anchor-hold*: Grace in a *Covenant*, or in a conditional *promise*, may seem to be Grace *bounded* and *limited*, but yet *hope* even *there* hath better anchorage than it hath upon God's general Grace and Philanthropy, which may bear up the Soul in a *calm*, but afford *little peace* to an *unquiet* mind: 'Tis the *Rock* of our Salvation revealed in the *promise*, that only *can stay that* Soul which is once *throughly awakened* and *convinced* of guilt. Now the Scripture doth reveal God's Grace engaged by Covenant to accept for *Christ's sake* all those that do depend upon his Son's merits, and *obey his Commands* by an effectual faith.

3. And that is another thing revealed in the Word, *viz.* The nature of that faith *by which* Believers do obtain an interest in God's Grace *through Christ*; and upon *this account* the Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance, in as much as, 1. It reveals *certainly* and *undoubtedly* that by faith in Christ we have an interest in God's most *free* and *promised* Grace. 2. That it reveals *certain* and *undoubted* marks of the nature of *true faith* in Christ. If then a Believer be by the Word informed that through faith in Christ he may certainly obtain pardon of sin; and if he be also *sufficiently* therein taught how to discover unfeigned from feigned faith by those certain κριτήρια or μαρτύρια which are laid down in the Word; what can *hinder* the possibility of a Believer's assurance? Especially if you shall consider in the second place the *manner* of Scripture-revelation, which proves it to be a *good* Foundation of assurance, in that it is, 1. full, 2. plain, 3. assuredly divine, 4. designed for assurance.

3. *Scripture reveals the nature of that faith whereby a Believer attains an interest in Christ.* 3 Joh. 16. Jam. 2. 17, 18. 1 Tim. 1.

2. *The manner of Scripture-revelation shews it to be a good Foundation of assurance.* Joh. 15. 15.

1. Scripture-revelation of the way of life is *full*; that is, all things necessary to be known both for *Salvation* and for the *furtherance of assurance*, are *fully* revealed, so as there is *nothing* wanting.

2. All things are revealed *plainly*, *clearly*, and so *intelligibly*, as that the lowest capacity may reach and *know* the will of God *so far* as concerns *Salvation*; and he that is *humble* and *obedient*, may understand whatever is necessary to be known concerning *Salvation* or *Assurance*, Joh. 7. 17.

3. All

3. All things are abundantly assured to us to be of divine Authority, God having been pleased to set the Seal of Miracles to the Patent of every Ambassador sent by him, and have attested the Commission of every Pen-man of Scripture, as appears *Heb.* 2. 3,4. But I do omit the full proof of the *sufficiency*, *perspicuity* and *divine Authority* of the Scripture, because it is so abundantly done by others, in the Discourses annexed.

A fourth property of Scripture-revelation is this, that it was revealed to *this very end* that men might *attain* to assurance thereby; so we are frequently told by God himself, *viz.* That *whatsoever things were written, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope*, Rom. 15. 4. And lest any one should think that the Spirit of God *by hope* doth only understand a conjecture, (as *Bellarmine* interprets the place) the Apostle *John* doth tell us, that the *express design* of his Epistle was, that those who believe might not *only* hope, but *know they had eternal life*, 1 Joh. 5. 12. and Christ himself tells Believers that he spoke all *those things that they might have joy, and that their joy might be full*, Joh. 15. 11. and the Author to the *Hebrews* gives us *this very account*, why God did not only *make* a Covenant of Grace, but did also *confirm* and ratifie it by an *Oath*, namely, *That Believers might have strong consolation*, or assured comfort. From all which 'tis evident Believers have a good Foundation of assurance *in* and *by* the Word. And moreover 'tis evident that the Word was *designed* for this end. Now the Rule is *most true*, *Deus & Natura nihil moliuntur frustra*, God and Nature design nothing in vain.

Bellarm. lib. 3. Just. cap 3.

Heb. 6 18.

Christ is Fundamentum Quod, *Scripture is* Fundamentum Quo.

3 *Arg. From the nature of man's faculties and power of Conscience.*

As God hath given Believers a good Foundation of assurance in the Word, so he hath given them *sufficient help* and *power* rightly and assuredly to *build upon* that *Foundation*, in as much as he hath indued them with *such faculties* as are able to *observe*, *discern* and *judge* of their *regular building* upon that *Foundation*: that is, God hath enabled them to discern *certainly* whether their *hearts* and *lives* agree with the rule of *faith* and *manners*. If God had created the *Sun*, but had denied men *eyes*, no man could have known the *path* which he *walks in*, or have *discerned* the *end* which he aims at: but God hath given both *light* streaming forth from *the Word*, and he hath given the *eye* of Conscience, that by *both* these men might come assuredly to know that they are *called out of darkness unto light*, and that they *walk in that narrow way that leads to life*, because they always make Salvation the constant white and mark of their way. The Church of *Rome* perverts all true Religion *at once*, and destroyeth all rational obedience to God's *command*, as well as they do undermine *all the best joys and comforts* of a good man's life, while they deny that any man can know assuredly what it is which he *chuses for his portion*, or what he doth *mostly prosecute*, or what is the *chief bent*,

Ephes. 5. 8.

Mat. 7. 14.

Luther *saith, that if there were no other errour in* Rome *but their denying the possibility of assurance, all men ought to reject communion with them.* Luther *in* Gen. 41.

from

frame or complexion of his heart, or what is the *tenour or course* of his life and conversation; whereas there are *few* persons living that bear not about them in their *own breasts* a convincing Argument from the testimony of Conscience, how much the general Conversation of *some* men *do depart* from the Rule of the *Word*, and how near *other* men (in the *tendency* of their lives) do *approach* to it. The dictates of *most men's Consciences* do tell them, how *great* a discerning they have of *good* and *evil*, and also of the *nature* of their *own actions: No man* can be *wholly* ignorant of the Law of God which is *written* in his own heart; and *few* men who live under the preaching of the Gospel, but are *conscious* of the *strivings* of the Spirit of God with them, and they *know* in *what* instance they have *complied* with its motions, and against *what calls* thereof they have *stopped* their ears: How much *more* then may *every true Believer* certainly know the saving work of God upon *him?* If an *unsanctified* person cannot *wholly* be a stranger to *himself*, surely then *the man* that dwells much at *home*, that frequently *descends* into his own heart, that *summons* his own Soul to *appear* before him, and to *come* to trial, this man cannot *easily* be ignorant what *agreement* there is between the *Rule* of God's Word, and the *method* of his Conversation. *Bellarmine* doth much urge that Text of the Prophet, *Jer.* 17. 9. *The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it?* If no man can *know his heart*, (saith the Cardinal) then none can *attain to assurance.* But we answer:

1. That though an *unregenerate* heart which is desperately wicked be *deceitful*, and not to be *known*, yet so are not the hearts of *true Believers.*

2. The Question is propounded of *one mans* knowing the heart of *another*, but not of a mans knowing *his own*; so *Peter Martyr* and others upon the place.

There are three Offices of Conscience which it is able to discharge, and thereby it doth exceedingly promote a Believers assurance.

1. There is in Conscience συντήρησις, by which power it is able to eye its Rule.

2. Συνείδησις, a power to compare man's actions with the Rule.

3. Κρίσις, a power to pass sentence or judgment either of *condemnation*, whereby it doth κατηγορεῖν, accuse; or of *absolution*, whereby it doth ἀπολογεῖν, excuse, as the Apostle speaks *Rom.* 1.

Conscience is both a Judge, a Witness, and an Executioner upon the tryal of man's heart and life.

1. Conscience is a Judge; I will not say it is a *King to give Law*, but it is *a Judge* to try and to pass sentence *according to Law:* Hence the Apostle *John* doubts not to say that the voice of Conscience is *one* and the *same* with the voice of God; *Hereby* (saith he) *we know we are of him in truth, and shall assure our hearts before him; if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things; but* 1. *Conscience is a Judge according to Law.* 1 Joh. 3. 19, 20, 21.

if our hearts condemn us not, we have confidence (even) before God: that person that is acquitted at the *Bar* by a *Judge*, acting according to Law, needs not fear to appear before the *King* himself on the *Throne*.

2. *Conscience a witness as to matter of fact.*

2. Conscience discharges the Office of a Witness; St. *Paul* calls it a witness, *Rom.* 9. 1. *I speak the truth in Christ, I lye not, my Conscience bearing witness*; and St. *John* gives it the same title, 1 *John* 5. 10. *He that believeth hath a witness in himself.* Heathens could say, *Conscientia mille testes*, Conscience is a thousand witnesses: but the Apostle speaks yet more, when he joins the Spirit of God as a co-witness with our spirits, *Rom.*8.16. *The Spirit it self beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God.*

3. *Conscience is a rewarder or punisher according to sentence given.*

3. Conscience is a Rewarder or Punisher according to the nature of the sentence which it pronounces: if Conscience doth *accuse*, no such severe Tormentor as Conscience is, as is evident in the instances of *Cain*, and *Judas*, and *Spira*; if Conscience doth *acquit*, no such *Comforter* and *Rewarder*; this (saith *Paul*) is our *rejoycing, the testimony of our Conscience*, &c. no such *joy*, no such *feast*, as *the joy and feast of a good Conscience.* Well may it be said, that *a good man is satisfied from himself:* This bread is often eaten in secret; 'tis hidden Manna, and is so *much the more pleasant:* this is joy that a *stranger meddles not withal*, and is so much the more secure; the *new name and the white stone none know but those that have them*, even the sons of consolation.

2 Cor. 1. 12.
Prov. 15. 15.
Prov. 14. 14.
Prov. 9. 17.
Prov. 14. 10.
Rev. 2. 17.

4 *Arg. Because it hath been attained.*

4. Assurance is possible to be attained because it hath been attained, *ab esse ad posse valet consequentia.* 1. *Job* declares his assurance in that he saith, *He knew that his Redeemer did live*; *his*, (emphatically his, not anothers Redeemer) *his Redeemer* as to *eternal* as well as *temporal* concerns; so he describes him, *He shall stand on the earth at the latter day*, (the day of resurrection) *after worms had devoured his skin and his flesh*, then should he see him owning and receiving of him into Glory, *Job* 19. 25, 26. 2. *David* also was so assured of his interest in God, that he with assured confidence requires Salvation from God's hand; *I am thine*, (saith he) *therefore save me.* 3. Another instance of assurance we have in *Hezekiah*, who could appeal to God on a death-bed, *That he had walked before God in truth with a perfect heart, and had done that which was right in God's sight*; and 'tis evident his assurance was good, for God accepts of the appeal, and declares it to be true, *Isai.* 38.3,4. But the most convincing instance is that of *Paul*, in the 8. *Rom.* 38. where he declares so great a Plerophory of assurance, *that he was perswaded neither life, nor death, nor any other thing should separate him from the love of God.* The Romanists do variously excruciate themselves to evade the force of this Text, *some of them say the Apostle* speaks only of a *conjectural* perswasion, but *Pareus proves* that the Apostle never useth the word πέπεισμαι, *I am perswaded*, (with reference to his own Salvation) but he intends full assurance by it: so in 2 *Tim.* 1. 12. *I know whom I have believed, and am perswaded* (that is, I am assured) that

Job 19. 25.
Vers. 26.
Psal. 119. 130.
Stapleton. Vasquez.

that he is able to keep that thing I have committed to him unto the great day. God's power is not an object of *conjecture*, but of *knowledge* and *assurance*. *Others* of that Church say, that although *Paul* was assured that not any *Creature* could separate him from the love of God, yet he was not sure but *he* might separate *himself* by the apostacy of his own will. Of these men the learned *Chamier* doth well demand, Whether the Apostles *Will* were not a *Creature*; and also, Whether God cannot by his own *power* keep our *wills* to himself, after he hath made us of *unwilling* to be a *willing* people. For notwithstanding there may after conversion remain a *natural power* in men to alienate their hearts from God, yet by Christ's Mediation and the Spirit's superintendency in *true Believers*, there remains no *moral power* actually to do it. And further, since no *Creature* can do any thing towards our separation from God but by our wills, 'tis folly (saith he) to think that the Apostle doth not *include a Believers will*, when he saith, *No Creature shall separate* a Believer from God. *Bellarmine*, to avoid the Text, runs to his old refuge, and grants that *Paul* was truly assured, but it was by an *extraordinary revelation*, which no other Believer can *ordinarily* attain to: The folly of this evasion I have already *in part* detected; *two things* more I desire may here be considered. 1. That when any persons have declared (*in the Scripture*) their full assurance, they have *spoken* of it not as of a thing of *extraordinary* revelation, but as of a *thing* of *evident probation*. 2. That *yet* they have spoken of their *assurance* as of a *thing* of *as great certainty* as can be desired. For the proof of *both these*, I shall instance in the *Apostle John*, who *often* asserts his assurance: but, 1. He *reckons* it not grounded upon *immediate revelation*, but upon *rational evidence and probation*, his words are these, 1 *John* 2. 3. *Hereby* (ἐν τούτῳ) *we know* (saith he) that we know him, if we keep his Commandments: and again, 1 *John* 3. 19. *Hereby* (the same word is here used again) we know we are of him *in truth*, and shall assure our hearts *before* him: you see, in both places he speaks *Argumentatively*, not by way of *Revelation*; and yet observe, 2. That his assurance was *full* and *strong*, for it is expressed by words importing as great assurance as can be expected, γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν, *scimus Quod novimus*, *We know that we know him*; and in the other Text the emphasis seems greater, *Hereby we know we are of him in truth, and we know we shall assure our hearts before him*; so that you see many Believers have attained to assurance, and therefore 'tis possible.

Salmero, Pererius.

Panstrat. Catthol. Tom. 3. Lib. 13.

Lib. de Just. 3. Cap. 5.

Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσμὲν, καὶ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. 1 Joh. 3. 19.

'Tis possible to attain to assurance, because God hath designed our assurance in the instituting of these Ordinances, which do *properly* tend to the *begetting* and *increasing* of assurance: that is, God hath therefore *confirmed* his *promises* and the *Covenant of his Grace* by visible *signs* and *seals*, for the begetting and promoting *our* assurance of his love and favour to us: There could be no *greater* reason of the institution of *circumcision* and the *Passover* under the Law, and of *Baptism* and the *Lord's*

6 Arg. From the Institution, Nature, use and End of the Sacraments.

Rom. 4. 11.

Supper under the Goſpel, than *God's intending* thereby the giving all *neceſſary* and *uſeful helps* and *furtherance* of ſubjective aſſurance. Hence it is that the Apoſtle *Paul* tells us, *That the promiſe and the bleſſing was ſure (in it ſelf) to* Abraham *long before he was circumciſed.* It may then be enquired, to what *end* was Circumciſion inſtituted? The ſame Apoſtle tells the *end* was, that it might be a ground of greater aſſurance; for ſo he ſaith, *Abraham received the ſign of Circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, which he had being uncircumciſed:* Now unto this ſeal of *Circumciſion* under the *Law*, the ſeal of *Baptiſm* anſwers in the *Goſpel*; and as the ſtriking of the *Blood of the Paſchal Lamb* on the *door-poſts* of the Iſraelites, gave *farther aſſurance* (after *the promiſe was made*) that the deſtroying Angel ſhould not ſmite the firſt-born of *any Iſraelite*; ſo the Inſtitution of the Lord's Supper was intended for a begetting the greater aſſurance in the heart of a *true Believer*, that God will not deſtroy him for the ſake *of the Blood of his Son* that is thereby *repreſented*; both Sacraments being intended as *Seals* of the Covenant of Grace *more viſibly ratifying* thereof to ſenſe, and confirming *Faith* thereby. Moreover, God in the Sacraments doth confirm a Believer's Faith, in as much as he doth therein, by his Miniſters, make a more *particular* and *perſonal* Offer and Application of his Grace to *every* true Believer. In the Sacraments there are to be conſidered, 1. The Confirmation; and, 2. The more ſpecial Application of the benefits of the *Covenant of Grace*; and by both theſe a Believers Faith is ſtrengthened, and his aſſurance is promoted. It is one Argument that *Becanus* the Papiſt uſeth againſt the poſſibility of aſſurance, *viz.* becauſe God hath not by *name* declared to any perſon that his ſins are forgiven, any where in *Scripture:* but this Cavil and Objection we have already obviated, and told you that all univerſal and general Propoſitions do include ſingular and particulars: It is no where ſaid, that *Thomas* or *John* ſhall not do any *murther*, or ſhall not *ſteal*; but the command is *as binding* as if they *had been named*; the caſe is the ſame in *Promiſes* as in *Commands:* but we might anſwer (*ſano ſenſu*) farther with St. *Bernard*, That in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is an actual *Exhibition* and particular *Application* made of the Grace of God, whereby all true Believers are *perſonally* and *actually inveſted* into that Grace by a *direct* and *immediate aſſurance* given. The Father explains himſelf *thus:* The Prieſt (ſaith he) in the Euchariſt doth as it were inveſt the Receiver with an aſſurance of pardon, as ſome men are inveſted into an Eſtate by a Rod or Staff, or as a Woman is inveſted into an actual intereſt in her Husband's Eſtate by her Husband's putting a Ring upon her Finger, or as a Canon is inveſted by a Book put into his hand, or as an Abbot is inveſted by a Staff. We do not ſay with the Papiſts, that the Sacraments do actually confer Grace by virtue of the external application: but we ſay that in the Sacrament there is an aſſured offer of Grace made to every Receiver, and unto all *true Believers* they do *ſign*, *ſeal* and *aſſure* a *certain* and *undoubted* intereſt in

Rom. 4. 11.

Bomino paſſioni appropinquans, Inveſtiri ſuos de Gratia ſua curavit, &c. Bern de Cœna Dom. Serm. 1.

Offerunt non conferunt, ſignant & obſignant.

in pardon. *Bellarmine* saith, That after the receiving of the Sacrament, as he calls it, of Absolution, very many Believers have, and all Believers ought to have a certain and confident assurance of pardon of sin: In which words of the Jesuite, I desire *three things* to be observed: 1. How openly and plainly *Bellarmine* contradicts himself. 2. How he hath incurred the *Anathema* of the *Trent*-Council. And, 3. How he hath conceded what we plead for. 1. This admired Doctor takes liberty to contradict himself, (as so great a Scholar may much better than another) for if you consult his third Chapter of his third Book of Justification, he there tells you that it is a gross errour to say that any Believer can have any such sure knowledge of their own Grace, so as that they can (by an assured Faith) determine that their sins are forgiven: but in the second Chapter of his third Book of Repentance, now quoted, you see that he had said before that after Absolution many Believers have, and ought to have an assurance of Faith that their sins are forgiven: if these things be not contradictions, I know not what are: some of his Friends would help him, by saying that there is difference between an assured Faith in one place, and an assurance of Faith in another; or between *certa fide statuere*, and *fiduciæ certitudinem habere*, if any one shall so distinguish; he will but farther discover his own folly, because *(certitudo fiduciæ)* assurance of Faith is (of the two) more *large* and comprehensive than *(certa fides)* which we translate sure Faith. *Assurance* or *Confidence* doth always *suppose* sure *Faith*, or certain *assent*, as the *ground*, *root* and *foundation* thereof. There may be *Faith* where there is no *Confidence*, but there can be no *Confidence* where there is no *Faith*: He that therefore saith, That 'tis possible for a man to be *assuredly confident* of the pardon of his sin, doth contradict *him* that saith, 'Tis not possible for any man *to believe* his sins are pardoned. *Bellarmine* by saying both these things doth plainly contradict himself. 2. But we shall wonder at this the less, because in the second place we may observe that he makes bold to contradict in most express terms his most holy Council of *Trent*; the words of which Council I quoted in the entrance of this Discourse; wherein they declare that *(certitudo fiduciæ)* assurance of *Faith*, or assurance of *Confidence* (translate it as you please) concerning pardon of sin *is vain* and *impious*: but *Bellarmine* saith that *many* Believers have (and all ought after Absolution to have) this *(certitudinem fiduciæ)* assurance of faith or confidence, call it by what name you will, yet the contradiction is direct: the same word being used by the Council and by the Jesuite. Now who can by any distinction reconcile these two contradicting Positions? and therefore I suppose none can free our poor Doctor from the *Anathema* passed upon him by the *Council*. For my part, I always thought a *Council* to be more infallible than the *Pope*, (though I will try before I will trust either of them) I am therefore *confident* the Pope did *err* when he made a *Saint* of this Cardinal, who we find accursed by the Council.

Post receptum Sacramentum plurimi fidelium habent, & habere debent fiduciæ certitudinem de remissione peccatorum. Bell. lib. 3. de Pœn. Cap. 2. Primus Hæreticorum error est, posse Fideles eam notitiam habere de sua gratia ut certa Fide statuant sibi remissa esse peccata. Bell lib. 3. de Justif. cap. 3. Fides est Fiduciæ Fundamentum, Fiducia est Fidei actus. Prideaux Lectio 7.

3. But

3. But we Protestants ought to pardon and absolve the Jesuite from this *Anathema*, pronounced for his contradicting the pretended general Council, *since* he doth not *in this* contradict the truth, but *doth grant all that which we plead for*, even almost in the *very words* and *terms* by which the Protestants them selves express it; for there is little or no difference between the very phrase which I have quoted out of *Bellarmine*'s second Book of Penance, and the very words of his Adversary *Chemnitius* in his Examen, *which are these*, That a *true Penitent*, or one that acts true Faith on Christ, may by *an assured confidence determine* that his sins are pardoned.

Peccator in seria pœnitentia ex fide in Christum possit certa fiducia statuere sibi remissa esse peccata Chemn. Examen, ad Sess. 6.

I shall conclude this Argument with *this note*, that if it be granted, that *after the pretended Sacrament of Penance and Absolution by a Priest*, a Believer may become assured of the pardon of his sin; he may *much better* conclude his sins to be pardoned after the right use of the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, which was designed to be a Seal and Confirmation *to his faith*.

6 Arg. Because it is possible to attain to all assuring evidences:

The sixth Argument is this, 'Tis possible for a Believer *to prove* that he is effectually called, by *all assuring evidences*; and therefore 'tis possible for him to attain to a certain knowledge that he is effectually called. There are *three*, and *but three sorts* of assuring evidences: 1. Demonstrative Argument: 2. Unerring sense: 3. Infallible Testimony. Now 'tis possible for a Believer to prove that he is effectually called *by all* these several sorts of evidences.

1. By Demonstrative Argument.

1. By Demonstrative Argument, that is a *Demonstration* which proves *either* the *being* and *existence* of a thing by its *inseperable* and *distinguishing effects*, or proves the *nature* and *kind* of a thing by the *special* and essential properties of it. Now a Believer may prove that he is *effectually called*, or that he is *regenerated*, and that the Spirit of God hath *infused the habits* of saving Grace into him,

1: From the proper effects of infused habits of Grace.

First, by peculiar, proper, and distinguishing effects of infused habits of saving Grace: the effects of all *habits* are their *respective* acts; and although *all sorts of gratious acts* do not prove *habits* of true Grace, yet God hath declared in his Word that there are *some acts*, and *some exercises of Grace*, which do demonstratively prove infused habits of Grace, and do *evidence* an effectual call; this is proved by 1 *Thess.* 1. 3. compared with Verse 5. In the 5 Verse *Paul* tells the *Thessalonians*, *That the Gospel came not to them in word only, but in power also, and in the Holy Ghost, and much assurance:* that is, he tells them they were effectually called: but how may this be proved? what evidence is it built upon? See Verse 3. he proves it by *two* things: 1. By the indwelling habits of Grace, *viz.* Faith, Love, and Hope: 2. By the distinguishing acts of those Graces, *viz.* working, labouring and patience; *remembring* (saith the Apostle) *your work of faith, your labour of love, and patience of hope.* Now in the same manner (as *Paul* doth) 'tis possible for many true Believers to prove *Demonstratively* also the truth of *their* Grace. 1. They

may

may prove the truth of their *Faith* by its *work*; the Apostle *James* saith, that works do *shew*, or (as the words signifie) *demonstrate* the truth of Faith: *all* sorts of works do not *prove* Faith to be saving, but *some* works do manifest it; and by them 'tis possible to prove an effectual call. I will name (and I must but name) some works of Faith, which are all so many Demonstrations of true Faith. 1. Prizing the Lord Jesus above all things, *Phil.* 3. 8. 2. Receiving him in all his Offices as offered in the Gospel, *John* 1. 8. 3. Victory over the World, 1 *Joh.* 4. 4. 4. Quenching of Satan's fiery darts, *Ephes.* 6. 16. 5. Purifying of the heart, *Act.* 5. 9. Where-ever these works or effects of Faith are, there certainly is saving faith.

1. *The work of Faith,* ἔργον, Jam. 2. 18.

1 Pet. 2. 7.

2. Love may be demonstrated by its labour, that is, by its exercise and peculiar fruits and effects. The word *labour* of *love*, mentioned by the Apostle, is used not to signifie any *irksomness* or *burthen* that love feels, for nothing more *delightful* and *pleasant* than the *work of love*; but to intimate the *diligence*, *constancy*, and *universality* of loves exercise: where love to God is sincere, there love commands the heart, the interest of God in such souls is superiour to all other Interests; hence *God's Commands are not grievous*; and this is a property of love, *that demonstratively proves* it to be the work of the *Spirit* in an effectual call: if the Apostle *John* had any Logick in him, he thought this to be a Demonstration, *That he that keepeth his Word, in him verily* (i. e. certainly, undoubtedly) *is the love of God perfected*; that is, Evangelically compleat and sincere. The nature of true love is such, that it will make it self manifest; if men would *design* to conceal it *from others*, 'tis difficult to be *hid*; but for a man to hide it from *himself* it is impossible: the consideration of which forces *Bellarmine* to confess, that love to God, or charity, is a most *certain note* whereby alone the Children of God may be *distinguished* from the Children of Satan. Thus again while our Adversary opposes the *possibility* of assurance, he doth contradict himself, and most fully grant it *to be possible*, because there are confessedly some *certain* marks and signs of the Children of God; and by *these* fruits they may be known: we have instanced in two Graces of *faith* and *love*; we shall instance but in one other, *viz.*

2. *Labour of Love,* κόπος & ἀγάπης. 1 Thess. 1. 3.

1 Joh. 5.

1 Joh. 2. 5.

Bell. Lib. 4. Just. Cap. 15. *Charitas est ipsa sola certissima nota, Quæ filii Dei a filiis Diaboli decernuantur.*

Hope: this Grace may be *demonstratively proved* to be *wrought* by the Spirit in an effectual call, by that distinguishing effect or consequence of it, (which the Apostle mentions also in the fore-quoted place) *viz.* a *constant*, *patient submission* to the Will of God, in parting with *any* or *all* the *enjoyments* of this life, and in *bearing* whatever *affliction* God in his *Wisdom* shall think fit to *try* a Believer with. I do not say that either *hope* or *patience*, when *separately taken*, but *only in conjunction one with the other*, are certain signs of true Grace: there is a great deal of *presumption* or *false hope* in the World; but *false hope* is never followed with *self-denial*, or with an *intire resignation* to the Will of God, so as to forsake all and to follow Christ. On the other hand, there may be some-

3. *The patience of hope.*

some kind of *patience* which may be nothing but a *Stoical apathy*, and a *senseleſſneſs* under ſufferings, or only a *blind boldneſs* to engage with difficulties. Now this often-times ariſes from pride, not from Evangelical hope, nor from a ſenſe of intereſt in the love of Chriſt. Now we do not ſay that ſuch hope or patience when ſo divided are certain Arguments of Regeneration, but they are only ſo in *conjunction*; and we ſay that patience, *when* 'tis a fruit of *Goſpel-hope*, 'tis then an effect of the Spirit's work, who hath infuſed that *hope* as an habit of ſaving Grace; and 'tis Demonſtratively proved to be ſo, becauſe this hope is of the ſame nature as ſaving faith, and it hath many evidences which certainly manifeſt it to be ſaving: 1. This hope *purifies the heart*, 1 Joh. 3. 3. 2. This hope *rejoiceth the heart*, Rom. 5. 2. 3. It aſſures the heart, *Heb.* 6. 11, 19. 4. It ſaves the ſoul, *Rom.* 8. 24. Now theſe effects are able to diſtinguiſh preſumption from *right hope*, and alſo Argumentatively to evidence an effectual call.

Our Adverſaries grant a certainty of hope, and therefore muſt grant a certainty of Faith; for Scripture uſeth often to ſpeak of both theſe as one Grace, and the Hebrew word בטח *ſignifies both to believe and hope.*

2. From the eſſential properties of ſaving habits.

2. 'Tis poſſible to prove by Demonſtrative Argument that the Spirit of God hath infuſed the habits of ſaving Grace into the heart by the ſpecial and eſſential properties of theſe habits. There are four properties of ſome *acts*, which do prove the exiſtence of *habits*; and do evidently ſhew, that thoſe acts and exerciſes do *flow* from *principles* or *habits*, either, 1. naturally, or, 2. acquired, or, 3. infuſed; and the four properties are theſe: 1. *Facility* and promptneſs, or preparedneſs to act. 2. *Delight* and pleaſure in acting. 3. *Univerſality* as to the object about which it acts. 4. *Conſtancy* as to continuance in acting. Now 'tis poſſible for a Believer to diſcern that the exerciſe of his Grace hath all theſe properties, and thereby he may demonſtratively prove that his Graces are habitual, and conſequently that they were infuſed in an effectual call, (for I have proved that they cannot be natural or acquired habits) and therefore they muſt be infuſed, that 'tis poſſible for a Believer to *attain* to theſe properties, and to *diſcern* them, I ſhall *briefly prove* (although I could be large) in the inſtance of *David*, who attained to, and diſcerned, 1. A facility and readineſs, a fixedneſs and preparedneſs in the exerciſe of his Grace, as you may ſee *Pſal.* 108. 1. and *Pſal.* 57 7. 2. A joy, delight, and pleaſure in acting or doing the Will of God, *Pſal.* 40. 8. and *Pſal.* 119. 16, 35, 47, 70, 92, 143, Verſes. 3. An Univerſality in his Obedience, and in that reſpect which he had to all God's Commands, *Pſal.* 119. 6. 4. A conſtancy and continuance (not as to *every* particular, but as to the *general* courſe) of his Obedience, *Pſal.* 73. 25. *Pſal.* 119. 44, 117. That other Believers may attain to the ſame properties as *David* did, none can deny; and that they may diſcern them as *David* did, can be as little denied; and therefore 'tis poſſible to prove an effectual call by demonſtrative Argument.

All theſe properties are comprehended in thoſe two words in Pſal. 51. רוח נדיבה *a free ſpirit*, רוח נכון *an eſtabliſhed ſpirit*, Maimon. more Nev.

2. 'Tis poſſible for a true Believer to prove that he is effectually called by

2. Unerring ſenſe. The Lord H. ſaith, Every being is indued with ſenſe, even the very Elements: Eſt in q ovis inarticulato & incanto Elemento, inſtinctus quidam Naturalis, Herb. de Veritate. *The* Pythagoreans *thought it equal cruelty to cut off the branch of a tree, as to break the leg of an Ox, or the arm of a man, affirming that all trees were indued with ſenſe.* Diog. Laert. de vitis Phil.

an unerring sense. Every kind of life is indued with a *sense proper* to its *nature*; for there is a certain connexion between *life* and *sense*; and the more *high* and *noble* any principle of life is, the more *clear* and *perspicuous* are the *sensations* and *perceptions* of that principle. The senses of the *animal life* are evident, and the perceptions of the *rational life* are more discernable than they; but no sense so quick and clear as that of the *divine life*, because the principle thereof is more *high* and *noble*. Here possibly a *half-witted Pretender to Reason*, will *cry out*, That to discourse of *spiritual senses* and the perceptions of the *divine life*, is to speak nothing but *Enthusiasm*, and things which *none* understand. I answer, *Mounsieur des Cartes* was *far* enough from Enthusiasm; yet that Master of Reason builds all his *Philosophy* upon a principle of inward sense, *viz. Cogito ergo sum, I know I think*, therefore *I know I am*. And he farther tells us, That the Idea, or *inward sense* of a God, is the *best* Argument to prove there *is one*. Again, I ask were the Philosophers of old, *Plato* and *Aristotle*, Enthusiasts, who agreed in this, that all men are *naturally endued* with a double faculty of discerning? one they called, *facultas διανοητικη*, a discoursive faculty; the other, *facultas νοητικη*, an intellective faculty; by the latter of which, some truths (they said) were intuitively and directly see ἀμεσως, not by augmentation, but by internal sense; and this all men know and acknowledge who are self-acquainted in any measure. And agreeable hereunto the Spirit of God is pleased to *represent* the *perceptions* of the divine life by expressions of *sense*, as of *seeing the Just One*, Acts 22. 14. of hearing, and *learning of the Father*, John 6. 45. of *smelling a savour and sweet odour in Gospel-revelations*, 2 Corinth. 2. 14. of *tasting that God is good*, Psalm 34. 48. of *touching and handling the Word of Truth*, 1 Joh. 1. 1. Now as 'tis *folly* to strein Scripture-allusions too far, and to take its Metaphors in the literal and *proper sense*; so 'tis *madness* and *gross ignorance* on the other hand to think that by *these expressions* the Spirit of God did not *intend* to inform us, that every true Believer doth as *truly discern spiritual* objects by an *internal* sense, as any man doth discern *material* objects by his *bodily senses*.

Cartesius de Methodo.

Aristot. lib. 2. Post. cap. ult.

I shall instance but in *three acts* of divine sense, whereby 'tis possible for a Believer to prove sensibly that he is effectually called.

Three acts of sense, whereby a Believer may know that he is effectually called.

1. Many Believers do see such a *light* breaking in upon their understanding, as doth *manifestly declare* it self to be the especial work of God's own Spirit; for by *two properties* the teaching of *God's Spirit* may be *distinguished* from the common teachings of *men*, or from the *sole convictions* of a natural Conscience: 1. By the *clearness* and *fulness* of this light; when the Spirit co-operates with the Word, then a Believer in *God's light sees light*, as the Psalmist phraseth it, he sees eye to eye, as the Prophet *Isaiah* expresses it, *Isai.* 51. 8. Divine light is *full*, and *descends deep*, and enters far into the minds of men; Wisdom *enters the soul*, Prov. 2. 4. God *shines into the heart*, 2 Pet. 1. 19. And

1. By discerning a divine light illuminating his understanding. Psal. 36. 9.

hence truth is said to be *wrote*, *Heb.* 8. 10. to be *engraven*, 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. to be *sealed*, Job 33. 16. on man's heart and soul. 2. By its influence on *practice*; no truly divine teaching is or can *be detained in unrighteousness*; and hereby 'tis distinguished from common teaching; *Sun-light* is distinguished from Moon-light by its *brightness*, and by its warmth also; a meer natural conviction is like a flash of lightning in the night, which makes a *short* discovery of some objects, but vanishes before a man takes one step of his journey: but when the *Spirit* teaches by the *Word*, the Spirit makes the Word *a light to a Believer's feet, and a lamp to his paths*; that is, it becomes a practical light, and hereby 'tis also known to be effectual.

Rom. 1.

Psal. 119. 105.

2. *He feels a divine power prevailing upon his will.*

2. A true Believer feels a divine *power* prevailing upon his will, which he proves to be *supernatural* both by the exceeding greatness of it in its *principle*, and also by the mighty working of it in *its effects*: The Apostle *Paul* desires of God that the *Ephesians* might *know* that they were effectually called, and that they might also know the hope thereof, in *Ephes.* 1. 18. And in Verse 19. he declares *how* this might be *obtained*, namely, 1. by discerning *the exceeding greatness of God's power towards them that believe*, (that is in its principle:) 2. by discerning the working of this mighty power *in them* that believe; that is, in the effects thereof. God's power exercised upon, and towards Believers, is said here in its self to be *great*; nay more, 'tis *greatness*; farther yet, 'tis *greatness of power*; higher yet, 'tis *exceeding greatness of power*: Can this power be put forth upon man, and man be wholly insensible thereof? 'tis impossible; especially if you add the other consideration of the effects that are wrought by this power in Believers, such as these, the quickning of life-less *Sinners*, *and the raising of them from the dead*; *the renewing of the spirit of the mind*; *the putting on the new man, which is created after the image of God in Christ Jesus, in righteousness and true holiness*: these signal effects which a Believer cannot but feel, do as certainly prove an effectual call, as the work of the old Creation do prove the existence of a *God*; or the *Miracles* wrought by *Christ*, did prove him to be the *Son of God*.

Τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. Ephes. 1. 19.

Cap. 2. v. 1.

Cap. 4. v. 23, 24

3. *He hath a spiritual taste of the goodness of God, and his ways.*

3. A true Believer hath a spiritual *taste* of God's love and favour, and of the *goodness* of his ways, and by it he is able to prove that *he is born of God*, according to that of the Apostle, 1 *Pet.* 2. 1. But *Bellarmine* here doth object, That *Hypocrites* and *Apostates* are supposed in *Heb.* 6. to have a *taste* of the good Word of God. I answer, 1. An Hypocrite may have a taste of the Word, but 'tis *but a taste*; whereas a true Believer drinks so deep of these waters of life, that *they become a well of living water springing up to everlasting life*. 2. Although a Hypocrite may have some taste of the sweetness of the *Word*; yet he always *tastes* a *greater* sweetness in the *World*: but 'tis contrary in *Believers*; *David* tasted the Word to be *sweeter* than *Honey*, and *more* precious than much fine *Gold*. The stony ground *received* indeed *the Word* with

Bellarmine's *Objection from* Heb. 6. 4, 5. *answered.*

Joh. 4. 14.

Psal. 19. 10.

Mat. 13. 20, 21.

with joy at first, but parted with it *again*, rather than undergo the *sorrow* of persecution. 3. An Hypocrite may taste some sweetness in the *promises* and *priviledges* of the Word, and the *gifts* of the Spirit, but not in the *precepts* of the Word, or *graces* of the Spirit: *Simon Magus* would part with the *World*, and give *Money* for the *miraculous power* of the Spirit; but he regarded not the *sanctity* of the Spirit, or *obedience* to its Laws; but a Believer thinks *that in the very keeping of God's Commands there is great reward*; *and* David *professes his delight to do the will of God*: so that by these, and many other *acts* of sense, (which I must not name) a Believer is able to *prove* that he is *effectually called*, and and that *certainly*, and without *errour* or *mistake*: For the Rule holds good in the due exercise of *spiritual* as well as *bodily* sense, That *Sensus non fallitur circa proprium objectum*; *Sense cannot be deceived about its proper object*: bodily sense is so certain, as that Christ himself appeals to it; in a proper case, Reason discerns that Spirits have neither flesh or bones, and Christ bids his Disciples to exercise their *sense*, and to *feel* that he had both. From the certainty of outward sense, we do *most* justly reject the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*: The Receiver *sees* bread, *feels* bread, *smells* bread, *tastes* bread, and yet the *senseless* Priest would have men believe that 'tis flesh. But a *Papist* will tell you, that there may be *disceptio visus*, a mistake in sight and sense, both *external* and *internal*. I answer, The evidence of sense in *general* is certain and unerring, (although there may be some mistake in *particular* acts of sense) upon two accounts: First, Because the causes of *particular* errours may always be known to be, 1. either the ill disposition of the Organ, as in a Jaundice-eye; or, 2. the distance of the object, as the apparent smallness of heavenly bodies; or, 3. the different *medium* through which the object is beheld, as a staff half in water and half out seems crooked. Secondly, Because by much experience, observation and guidance of reason, men have been able to form and establish certain Rules whereby to rectifie all these mistakes. In like manner (by the Guidance of the Spirit) God hath given in his *Word* most *certain* Rules whereby men may *know* from whence the *mistakes* of *internal* sense do arise, and in what manner, and by what means they may be corrected. From all which I may safely conclude, that *as* there are certain Sciences built upon the certainty of bodily sense, (as Opticks, and many other Mathematical Sciences) notwithstanding particular mistakes in some acts: so 'tis possible by experience and observation, together with the *Guidance* of the *Word* and *Spirit*, for a Believer to prove, that his spiritual sense doth not err, and consequently that he is effectually called.

Act. 8. 18, 19.

Psal. 19. 11.

Sense is a certain and unerring evidence, Luk. 24 39. *The Papists are of the opinion of* Hieraclitus, Καὶ μάρτυρες, ἀνθρώπων ὀφθαλμοὶ, *No man must believe his eyes. Like as the Philistins dealt with* Samson, *they would put out our eyes, that we might grind in their Mill, or bring grist to it: Like the Pharisees*, Joh. 9. 25. *That would perswade the man born blind, that he was so still, because they were unwilling to own Christ, the Author of his sight.*

2 Pet. 1. 19.

3. By infallible testimony of the the Spirit.

In the last place, I say, 'tis possible for a Believer to prove that he is effectually called, by infallible testimony of the Spirit: this sort of evidence, by *Authority* or *Witness*, Logicians call *Argumentum artificiale*, an artificial Argument; but in our case 'tis *Argumentum certissimum*, a most certain proof: for if God hath said, *That in the mouth of two or three* humane *Witnesses every word is established*, that is, *made sure*; how much more sure is the evidence that is given in by the Spirit of God, who cannot lye?

Deut. 17. 6.

Heb. 6. 18.

This testimony either written, or real: the real testimony is either, 1. Material, mediate and objective.

Now the testimony of the Spirit of God, is either *written* in the *Word*, or *real* in its *Works*: How far the written testimony of the Spirit in Scripture (which is Θεόπνευστος) is a foundation of assurance, I have already declared: The *real* testimony of the Spirit is two-fold: 1. *Material*, *mediate*, and only *objective*, *viz.* When the Spirit of God by the work of sanctification wrought in a Believer, doth thereby afford to a Believer objectively (and mediately by the fruits of the Spirit) matter of proof or evidence, whereby he may evince by argument, that he is effectually called. This sort of evidence I have also already spoken to; therefore 'tis yet another kind of testimony of the Spirit that I would here more especially insist upon; namely, the *efficient*, *immediate*, and *formal testimony* of the Spirit of God. Several Divines call it by several names, but they all understand *one* and the same thing, that there is a witnessing work of the Spirit, distinct from the *regenerating* work, and from the sanctifying work thereof, is evident by that plain Text of the Apostle to the *Romans*, where he saith, *That the Spirit it self beareth witness with our spirits*, *that we are the children of God*: Where observe, 1. The *testes*; 2. The *testimonium*; 3. The *modus testificandi*.

2 Tim. 3. 16.

2. Formal, immediate and efficient.

Rom 8. 16.

Three things considerable in these words. 1. The witnesses.

First, observe the Witnesses; these are two: 1. The Spirit of God: 2. Our own spirit: These are two *distinct* Witnesses, and we ought always to consider them as truly and properly distinct: For as the Spirit of God is really and personally distinguished from our spirits; so the act of the Spirit in witnessing is as truly distinct from the act of our own spirits. A Believers own spirit doth sometimes prove, and may witness actually and truly its effectual call; and yet the Spirit of God may at that time suspend its immediate testimony, *pro hic*, *& nunc*. Now all those things which can be really separated, are to be considered as distinct, even then when they are *conjoined*; and that the testimony of the Spirit of God is distinct from the testimony of our spirits, is evident from the words themselves, being duly considered: for the Apostle saith, That *the Spirit it self* witnesseth *with our spirits*; but of this more, after we have considered,

Not τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, but αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα.

2. The testimony or thing witnessed.

2. The testimony, or the thing witnessed; which is this, That we are the sons of God; which phrase comprehends, 1. A Believers *Regeneration*. 2. His *relation*, of an adopted son of God. 3. His partaking of the *divine nature*, or being conformed to the Image of Christ. 4. His

obtaining

obtaining of a *right of co-inheritance* with Christ. Now *Regeneration*, and an *effectual call*, (I have shewn) are one and the same thing: the matter of this testimony therefore, witnessed both by our spirits, and also by the Spirit of God, is this, That we are effectually called.

3. The manner of witnessing is expressed by the word Συμμαρτυρῶ; the Spirit doth co-witness, which cannot be meant (as some would have it) *only* of the Spirit's using the faculties of *our mind instrumentally*, (as a Scribe useth a Pen as his Instrument to attest any Writing.) 'Tis true, that the Spirit of God doth bear witness with our spirits, that is, *by* our spirits, *in as much as* our *own* faculties are *employed* in *receiving* and *discerning* the testimony of God's Spirit; but yet we must be careful that we do not *confound* the *acts* of God's Spirit with the *acts* of our own *faculties* in this testimony: for so we should also confound the distinction of the *Witnesses* themselves, and we should hardly escape confounding the distinction that is between the Spirit's *objective* or *material* testimony, and its efficient and *formal* testimony. For avoiding of which, and for opening of the manner of the Spirit's *immediate* witnessing, I desire that these things may be considered.

3. The manner of witnessing.

Opened in three parts.

1. That the Spirit of God when it is said to witness with our spirits, is not to be supposed to give its testimony by any *external voice* or *words*, but it gives even its immediate testimony by some *work* or *operation* upon the mind of man. That all sorts of spirits can express themselves to spirits *without words*, is manifest in the acknowledged converse or communion that is between Angels amongst themselves, good Angels with good, and bad with bad; as also by the suggestions of *good* Angels and *bad* Angels upon the minds of *men*; as also by that which the Scripture saith of mental or *unexpressed* unuttered prayer, in *Rom.* 8. 26. and by the instance of *Hannah*. If *created spirits* can express themselves to spirits *without words*, much more may the *Eternal Spirit* reveal himself to the mind of man *how* or *as* he pleases. He that *created* the faculties of man's mind, *can put them* into *acts* and *exercise* by what ways or means soever he pleases: He that knows our thoughts *before we think them*, can cause us to *think* or *know* whatever he pleases to impress upon them.

1. 'Tis by some operation, not voice; spirits speak the language of spirits, and of their own region.

Some Philosophers have undertaken to shew the way whereby the Angels and Spirits do converse.

1 Sam. 1. 13.

Ezek. 38. 10.

2. As all the *Revelations* of God's Spirit are *harmonious*, and *consonant* one with another, so are all the *Works* of God's Spirit always *agreeable* and *concording*, so as *one* work thereof destroys not *another* work of the same Spirit; and thence it is, that God having endued men with *faculties* of *judging* and *discerning* of truth by its proper evidences, doth never cause the soul of man to *believe* any truth, but he gives them a *ground* or *reason* of its belief. I do not say that he gives always a reason of the thing, but he gives a reason of our belief: the *supernatural* works of the Spirit, do not *destroy*, but *restore* and *perfect Nature*. Now the *natural* way of conviction of man's mind being by evidencing the *reason* of things; hence, when the Spirit convinces man

2. 'Tis by rational conviction.

of

of any thing, he doth (as it were) by Argument. The Spirit of God convinces men of *righteousness*, and of *pardon* of sin, in the same manner that it convinces of sin, and its guilt, which is by way of Argument, as the word ἐλέγχει doth signifie, in *Joh.* 16. 8. Hence Faith also (which is wrought by the Spirit) is said to be ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων, the Argumentative *evidence of things not seen.* I hope no man is so weak as think that the Spirit convinces by *verbal expression* of the terms of three Propositions of an Argument; but yet it doth something equivalent thereunto. For,

Heb. 11. 1.

3. *'Tis by special Illumination.*

3. The *proper* work of the Spirit in *giving this testimony*, is to *illuminate the mind of man*, both in a *greater degree*, and *to another end* than it did *illuminate* it in its *first* work of *Conversion:* In *Conversion*, the objects revealed are *those*, that, being once *discovered*, do engage the soul to put forth the *direct* act of faith; but in this witnessing work, the Spirit reveals *those* objects that by their discovery do *enable* the soul to exercise the *reflex* act of faith; and *withal* the Spirit doth *immediately assist* the mind of man in its act of *reflexion* upon the work of sanctification formerly wrought by the Spirit.

You may understand *both* the *nature* and *distinction* of the Spirit's testimony, how it is *different* from the testimony of our own spirits, by this *similitude:* Suppose a *purblind person*, reading a *small* print by the light of a *farthing* Candle, by which he *knows*, and is able to *testifie truly* what is written in that Book which he so reads; yet when he considers *how apt* he may be *in those circumstances* to mistake, he still doubts *comparatively* to what he knows: when a *skilful Oculist* hath repaired his *sight*, and hath by Glasses magnified the *Characters* of the Book, and hath let into the room *the beams of the Sun*, which were before withheld. Thus the work of the Spirit is to assist our *faculties*, and strengthen them; to irradiate and illustrate its *own work* of sanctification, and also to bring in *a fuller light* from the Word, making it speak more *clear* and full: by all which the Spirit of God may be said to give a different and distinct testimony from that which our *unassisted* faculties, or *gradually unenlightened* minds could give of themselves.

Quest. 1. *Why is this called a co-witness?*

1. If it be asked, Why this act of the Spirit of God is called a *co-witnessing* with our spirits? I answer, First, because the Spirit *adds* its special assistance *to our* spirits, in all and every exercise of *our faculties*, about their giving in their testimony. In particular, 1. It irradiates the mind; and, 2. It more *emphatically* reveals to the soul the truth of the *promise*, that every one that believes shall be saved; 3. It more *fully* makes known its own work, and shews to the soul by *good evidences* that it doth believe; 4. It assists the reason of man more *convincingly* to draw the conclusion, that therefore it shall be saved: And in this manner the Spirit witnesses to every Proposition of the assuring Argument. Secondly, and more especially, the Spirit is said to witness *with* our spirits, because the *matter witnessed* by the Spirit of *God*, is the same which

is

witnessed by our *own* spirits; and this properly speaks it to be a co-witness; for it witnesses not only in the same manner, but it also witnesseth the same matter which our spirits do witness.

2. If it be demanded, How a Believer may be assured that the Spirit doth certainly witness with our spirits? I answer, he may be assured by two things: 1. By that *special distinguishing light* that accompanies the testimony of the Spirit, which doth *manifest* it self so as to *over-bear* all *doubts* and *disputes* both about our *spiritual* estate, and about this *testimony* it self: just as the *light of the Sun* doth not only *discover other things*, and *reveal* them; but doth manifest it *self* by its *self-evidencing property*, which is *able* to *convince* every beholder. 2. By the *harmony* and *agreement* that is between the testimony of the Spirit of God, and our spirits; just as we know the testimony of our spirits to be certain and true by its agreement with the Word; except all these *three* agree in one, there can be no full certainty: but a Believers assurance is always confirmed by the *concurring testimony* of these three: 1. Of the Word, 2. Of Conscience, and 3. Of the Spirit, all witnessing *one* and the *same* thing. 1. The *sure Word* of God lays down certain signs and marks of true Grace, and witnesses these signs to be good evidences. 2. Then *Conscience*, or our *own spirit* witnesses that these signs are found in a Believer. 3. Then God super-adds the witness of his own Spirit, which enables us yet *more fully* to know the things which are freely given us of God: And now what doubts can remain? 'Tis true, we are bid to try every spirit, and we have a *way* to try them *by*, *viz.* the *agreement* of *their* testimony with the testimony of *Scripture* and *Conscience:* although there may be such things as παρήλια, or Mock-Suns, and sometimes the Glory of the true Sun (which yet is a prodigiously rare instance) is not able to distinguish it self from its *Apes*; yet in this very case (by the Rules of Calculation) an Astronomer is able to distinguish the *true* Sun from the *false*, so that the Science of *Astronomy* is never a whit *the less* certain: 'Tis so as to the Spirit's testimony; 'tis certain that by the Word and Conscience a Believer may *infallibly* prove the testimony of the Spirit to be *true*, and not false, because there is and must be an universal agreement between all these three.

Quest. 2. *How is a Believer certain that the Spirit doth witness?*

Οὐαν τὸ πνῦμα μαρτυρῇ πολλοῖς τὸν ἀμφιβολίαν. Chrysost. in Rom 8.

Our Adversaries have (*many* of them) endeavoured to *enervate* the single testimony of *Scripture*, because of the *mysteriousness* of Scripture, as they call it. *Others* seek to debilitate the testimony of *Conscience*, because men are apt to be *partial*. Others would weaken the testimony of the *Spirit*, because 'tis apt to be *mistaken*. But should we grant that none of those three Witnesses were *separately* sufficient, yet when they are *conjoined*, from thence there doth arise an *undoubted* assurance. Although the *strength* of one *Pillar*, or the soundness of the *Foundation* alone not prove a House to be well built; yet the strength of *all* the Pillars, and of the Foundation considered together, do fully prove it to be strong. What if one single Souldier be not sufficient to secure a Fort? yet

yet may not many Souldiers do it? How much then do our Adversaries trifle, while they seek to engage one single Combatant as no good Witness of assurance? but they dare not look our Army in the face:

Heb. 12. 1. Behold, we are compassed about with a Cloud of Witnesses; let them dispel this Cloud if they can. Although no man can be made sure of the time of the day by a Dial that hath no *Figures* upon it; and although a *blind man* cannot know the hour when there *are* Figures upon the Dial; and although one that hath *good eyes*, and seeth the Figures, yet cannot know the time if the *Sun shines not*: yet from hence it doth not follow, but that if there be a *concurrence* of *Lines* and *Figures*, of *Sight* and *Sun-shine together*, and the Dial be made, and placed by *infallible* Rules of *Art*, it will then certainly evidence the time of the day. In like manner the *Graces* of God's Spirit imprinted on the heart, the *eye* of Conscience open in examination and observation, and the *light* of the Spirit as the Sun-shine, these three *concurring together*, and all of them *agreeing* with the *Word*, which is the standing *Rule* of judgment, by which *all* the other are *regulated* and *ordered*; I say, from hence ariseth a *demonstrative*, *undoubted*, and *infallible* certainty; and this *concurrenee* being *possible*, 'tis therefore *possible* for a Believer to attain to an assured knowledge that he is effectually called.

2. Special Proposition, That 'tis possible for one that is assured of his calling, to be thereby also assured of his eternal election; proved from the nature of election, and the dependance effectual calling hath thereon.

I proceed to the proof of the second special Proposition, That 'tis *possible for a Believer who is sure of his effectual vocation in time, to be assured also of his election in eternity.* I shall need to be but *brief* in the *proof* of this, having *already in part proved* that there is such a thing as *special* and *discriminating* Grace, whereby *one* call of God proves *effectual*, another *not*. Now our Adversaries themselves *grant*, that if God doth exercise a *discriminating* Grace in special *effectual vocation*, 'tis necessary that he should eternally *decree* to exercise that *special Grace* upon those persons from eternity. The proof of *this* Proposition will *depend* upon these *two* Arguments.

Arg. 1. An effectual call depends upon eternal election, as upon its necessary principal cause.

If an effectual call doth *depend* upon God's eternal election, as upon its *necessary* cause, then *he* that knows that he is effectually *called*, may know *he* was eternally *elected*; (no man of reason will deny this *Consequence*, and therefore I need not prove it.) But an effectuall call doth *depend* upon God's eternal *election*, as upon its *necessary* cause; and therefore he that knows the *one*, may also know the *other*: this I shall *prove* from some plain and express Texts of Scripture; see *Ephes.* 1. in the beginning of which Chapter you have the *nature* of election opened in all its *causes* and *properties*, (which I must not *particularly* name) in *brief*, you may observe that according to the Apostle's *description* thereof, *election is that decree of God, whereby out of the meer good pleasure of his own will, he did eternally chuse some certain individual persons out of the corrupt mass of mankind, unto the infallible attainment of Grace here, and Glory hereafter.* Now if this be the nature of election, *viz.* that Grace (or an effectual call) was thereby eternally *decreed* to be *conferred* and

and bestowed; it will then necessarily follow, that Grace, or an effectual call, *doth depend* upon election as *its cause:* which is plainly expressed, Vers. 4. where *Holiness* and *blamelessness* (which are insuperable properties of an effectual call) are said to be the effects *of God's election and choice.* 'Tis a very good note of *Thomas Aquinas*, who observes that *love* and *choice* in *God* doth very much *differ* from love and choice in *men:* for love in *men* (saith he) doth not *cause loveliness* in the *beloved*, but *men* first discern a *loveliness*, and this causes a *love* and *choice*; whereas God first exercised a *free love* in his eternal election, predestinating the way and means of farther *manifestation* of his love, and then in time he *effects* his own *purpose*, making the objects of his *love* to become *lovely*, by his renewing his own image upon them in an effectual call. Agreeable hereunto is that expression of the Council of *Orange*, *God loved us not as we are by our desert, but as he designed to make us by his gift.* He that would rightly understand the relation vocation in time, hath unto election in eternity, and he that would know the dependance which *that effect* hath upon *this cause*, must first consider, that although all the decrees of God are in themselves but *one* simple act of God's will; yet as to humane *apprehension* many men have *conceived* that there are *three distinct acts* of the Divine Will comprehended in his *decree of election.* 1. Ἐκλογὴ, a *choice*, or a *separating* and singling out of some individual persons to be the objects of his love. 2. Πρόθεσις, a *purpose*, or an intention and design of bestowing saving Grace in effectual calling of those chosen ones. 3. Προορισμὸς, a *Predestination*, or a pre-determination of bringing those called and gracious persons unto Glory. I shall not here meddle with the *Controversie* which is agitated about the *priority* or *precedency* of these *two* last acts of the Divine Will; only you must consider, that as the *decree* of God, whereby he purposed to bestow both *Grace* and *Glory*, was truly in it self but *one* eternal act of his Will, (and so there could be no priority of time amongst them) so we ought not *in our Conceptions* to distinguish between *Glory* and *Grace*, as if *one* were designed as the *end*, and the *other* as the *means*, (which is too common a mistake:) for *in truth*, Grace and Glory differ only as *lesser* and *greater* measures of the same thing; and therefore we say, that *God's absolute* and inconditionate purpose effectually to call some persons, and to give them Grace, passing by others, doth declare the *whole nature of God's decree of election*, in as much as the *selection* of the objects of God's love, and also the *nature* both of the *act* and *end* of his love, are all comprehended in that *one purpose* of effectual calling, which the *Salmurien Divines* do shew more fully in their explication of *election:* all which being duly considered, do abundantly manifest that *vocation* in time, was a most assured effect of *election* in eternity, according to that of *Rom.* 8. 23. where almost in express words *our calling* is said to be the effect of *God's purpose*; and agreeable also is that of 2 *Thess.* 2. 13, 14. where *sanctification* and *faith*

T. A. Sum. 1. par. Q. 23.

Tales nos amat Deus, Quales Futuri fumus, ipsius dono non quales fumus nostro merito Conc. 2. Can. 2.

Grace is Glory begun, Glory is Grace perfected, Preston New Cov.

Thes. Salm. de elect. Lib. 1. lec. 29. 30.

wrought in an *effectual call*, is declared to be the fruit of being *chosen from the beginning: We are bound to give thanks* alway *to God for you, Brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath chosen you from the beginning to salvation, through sanctification and belief of the truth whereunto he called you by our Gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ.* Observe here, first, that God hath designed to bestow Grace and Glory on some men: Secondly, that God actually accomplisheth his design by effectual calling of these persons; *i. e.* by working of faith, or a belief of the truth, and of sanctification in them: Thirdly, that the original and primitive ground or cause of an effectual call, is God's eternal election and choice of them. Therefore doth the Spirit bring the Elect into the state of Sons, because God hath predestinated them to the adoption of Sons. The Spirit is the immediate cause of Regeneration; but that the Spirit works otherwise in one person than it doth in another, is the effect of eternal election: And there is always so certain a dependance which an effectual call hath upon election, as that they are sometimes put for one and the same thing, *Rom.* 9. 11.

2 *Arg. Vocation depends upon election as its rule or measure.*

Secondly, We prove that all those that know they are effectually called, may know that they were eternally elected, because effectual calling depends upon God's eternal election as its *rule* or *measure*; that is, effectual calling (as to the persons called) is *commensurate* with the *objective matter* of God's eternal election: my meaning is this, that *all* those, and *only* those persons that were eternally *elected*, shall be effectually *called*; and *therefore* whoever *knows* that he is effectually called, may *know* he was eternally elected. The very *essence* of an effectual call consists, as I have shewn, in the Spirit's working of *saving faith* in *those* whom it doth call; but the *Spirit* works saving faith in *all* the elect, and *only* in them, this is plainly manifest in *Acts* 13. 48. *As many as were ordained to eternal life believed*; so many, and no more, as were *ordained*, or fore-determined: if the word be translated *fore-disposed*, (as some would have it) it must be meant of *God's* disposing, not of *man's* disposing himself. Some men talk much of a *tempus congruum*, a fit season for Conversion; but the Decree of God depends not upon our *predisposition*, but upon God's election, as appears in the instance of Saint *Paul*, who being a chosen vessel, was converted when he was in the *heighth* of his persecution. The *working* of faith depends so much upon God's election, as that *saving faith* bears the name of *the faith of God's elect*, Tit. 1. 1. it being proper only to them. Moreover, it appears that *only* those that are *elected* shall be *effectually* called, because only the elect shall be saved: it is expressly said, That all *those whose names are not written in the book of life, shall be cast into the lake that burns with fire and brimstone*, Rev. 20. ult. It was the custom of old to write down the names of persons designed to places of *Honour* in *Books* or *Registers*; hence the Spirit of God compares God's election of persons

Καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς, *a vessel of election*, Act. 9. 15

Roman Senators called Patres conscripti

ſons to *Grace* and Glory, to that *known cuſtom:* in alluſion unto which alſo St. *Paul* ſaith that the names of *Euodius*, and *Syntiche*, and *Clement*, were written *in the book of life*; and Chriſt bids his Diſciples *rejoice that their names were written in Heaven*; *i. e.* that they were elect: on the contrary, the non-elect are ſaid *not to have their names written in the Lamb's book of life*, in Rev. 13. 8. and Rev. 17. 8. and the doom of all ſuch is to be caſt into the lake of fire, for theſe ſhall never be called effectually here, or ſaved eternally hereafter. Phil 4. 3. Luk. 10. 20.

I know *Socinus* and *Crellius*, and ſome others, by the *book* of life, do underſtand the *Scripture*, wherein God hath declared that all *penitent* believers ſhall be ſaved, and all *impenitent* and unbelievers ſhall be damned; and conſequently (ſay they) all believers have their names written there; but unbelievers have not their names written, in as much as they come not under the Qualifications written in the Word. But to this I anſwer: 1. That by the Book of life muſt be meant God's *eternal* decree, not any declaration made by him *in time:* for the non-elect are deſcribed, *Jude* 4. to be men, πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, *of old ordained*, or eternally decreed, *to this condemnation*, as Biſhop *Dav.* obſerves: and on the other hand, the elect are ſaid *to be ſaved, and called with an holy calling, not according to works, but according to his purpoſe and grace which was given in Chriſt Jeſus before the world began.* 2. Again, in the Book of Life, there was an abſolute election of *perſons recorded*, and not a conditional Declaration of *qualities declared:* for by names (in all the fore-quoted places) are underſtood perſons, as appears by many other Texts of Scripture, as *Numb.* 1. 2. by *taking the number of names*, is meant the number of perſons, *every male by pole:* So *Act.* 1. 15. the number of *names*, that is, *perſons, were about an hundred and twenty:* and *Sardis* had *a few names*, that is, *a few perſons that were upright*, Rev. 3. 4. In vain therefore do either Papiſts or Socinians ſeek to divide thoſe things that God hath conjoined, *viz.* eternal election, and effectual vocation; which have that relation one to another, as that he that knows one, knows both: for if vocation depends on election as its neceſſary cauſe, and as its adequate rule and meaſure, I hope I ſhall not need to prove the conſequence, ſince all men grant that thoſe things that are commenſurate, and of equal extent, do neceſſarily make each other known. Epiſcop. Vorſtius, &c. Καὶ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν τὴν χάριν δοθεῖσαν πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, 2 Tim. 1. 9. Numerus electorum eſt Deo certus; non ſolum, ut cognitus, ſed ut electus & prædefinitus. *See* T. Aq. par. 1. q. 23. a. 7. *The elect, a determinate number as elect,* 7000 *which had not bowed to Baal,* 1 King. 19. 18. 144000 *ſealed,* Rev. 7. 4.

He therefore that would make his election ſure, may do it by making his calling ſure; and that is the order he muſt proceed in: for although God at firſt *chuſes*, and then *calls*; yet we muſt *firſt* know our calling, and *then* our election: God *deſcends* from *love* to *choice*, from *chuſing* to *calling*, or to *infuſing* of the principles of ſaving Grace, then to *ſanctifying*, or adding of *greater meaſure* of Grace; but in the trial of our ſtate, and in our *evidencing* of our *intereſt* in God's love, we muſt *aſcend* from *ſanctification* to *vocation*, and from *vocation* to *election:* Election is as the *Spring-head* of all conſequent acts of Divine love; he Rom. 8 29.

that would find the *fountain*, muſt begin at the *ſtream*, and ſo trace it upward to its firſt *ſourſe*: Election is (as the *root* or *ſeed*) *hidden*, *and unknown* in it ſelf; he that would *know* the nature of a Tree, let him not uncover the *root*, but let him obſerve the *fruits*, for by them it may beſt be known. Weak eyes may better behold the *beams* of the light reflected, than by looking on the *body* of the Sun, which many having *preſumed* to do, have *loſt* their ſight wholly: and ſo it comes to paſs, when men ſearch *directly* into the decree of *election*, without conſidering that it is better and more eaſily *manifeſted* by an effectual call. It is not lawful for any man to look into this *Ark*, or to attempt to read the Law of God's eternal purpoſes, as they are there locked up in his decrees; 'tis ſufficient that we may ſee the tranſcript of them written on our own heart: *Secret things belong to God, but revealed things to us and our Children.* No man muſt enter into the *Council Chamber*, that he may know the will of his *Prince*; but muſt wait for its diſcovery in the *publiſhed Proclamation*. *Mordecai* underſtood little of the King's love to him, when *Ahaſuerus* conſulted *what ſhould be done to the perſon whom the King delighted to honour*; but he well knew that he was a favourite when he ſaw himſelf *cloathed in Royal Robes*, *and beheld the King's Signet upon his hand*: ſo when a Believer finds himſelf *cloathed* with the *white linen of the Saints*, and hath once received *the Seal of God's Spirit*, he may ſafely conclude that God from eternity decreed to honour him here, and glorifie him hereafter.

Inter Gratiam & prædeſtinationem hoc tantum intereſt, quod prædeſtinatio eſt gratiæ præparatio; Gratia vero eſt ipſa donatio, Aug. de præd. cap. 10.

Deut. 24. 24.

Eſther 6. 10.

Rev. 19. 8, 14. 2 Cor. 1. 22.

Let me therefore for a cloſe of this ſecond Propoſition, give all *Believers* the ſame counſel that *Elihu* gave to *Job*, and *Job*'s friends, *Deſire not the night*, (*i. e.* pry not into the dark ſecrets of God's decrees) *but remember thou magnifie God's works which thy eyes do behold*; *i. e.* the fruits and conſequences of thoſe decrees appearing in an effectual call: 'Tis boldneſs to break ope the Seal of a Decree, till thou haſt read thy *Name* wrote in the *Superſcription*; Election is *Love under a Seal of ſecreſie*, but an effectual call *opens* this moſt *fully*, and evidently makes known the purpoſe of God from eternity.

Job 36. 20.

Third ſpecial Propoſition.

The third ſpecial Propoſition, which remains to be proved, is this, *That all true Believers that do aſſuredly know they are called, and were elected, may alſo know they ſhall perſevere unto glory.* Many have been the Diſputes concerning the poſſibility of a Believers falling from *Grace*; but moſt of the *Arguments* that are uſed with deſign to prove the *poſſibility* thereof, will *fall* to the ground if the *Queſtion* be rightly ſtated. To which purpoſe I ſhall in the *firſt place* lay down ſome premiſes, and which may *obviate* the Arguments and Objections of our Adverſaries; and then give you *our* Arguments to *prove* the Propoſition. When we ſay then that ſome Believers may aſſuredly know that they ſhall perſevere, and that they ſhall not fall from Grace, we do premiſe, that,

First, We do diſtinguiſh between Grace actively taken for God's favour to us, (*Gratia gratis dans*, as the Schools call it) and (*Gratia gratis data*) Grace paſſively taken, Grace wrought in us, (which is the effect of the former:) for it is not from the nature of Grace *paſſively* taken, or from Grace inherent in Believers, that they do *perſevere*, and not *fall* away; but it is from the nature of that Grace (actively taken) that dwells in God's boſom; this is the ground that Believers perſevere to Glory, as 'tis clearly expreſſed by Chriſt himſelf, *Joh.* 13. 1. *He having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them to the end.*

1 *Premiſe.* Χάρις & χάρισμα, differunt ſicut cauſa & effectus vel ut lux in ſole & Lumen in aere, Bradward. de cauſa Dei, lib. 2. cap. 13.

Concerning this *active* Grace of God, we do diſtinguiſh between the *exerciſe of it*, and the *manifeſtation* of that exerciſe: We deny not but God may ſeem to be angry; but yet we ſay he never caſts off his people, or forgets to be gracious. The Sun may be muffled for a time in a Cloud, yet ſome heat will be communicated during the time it is hid, and in due time the beams of light will break through, and diſperſe the Cloud alſo. Chriſt may ſtand behind the Wall, yet *then he will ſhew himſelf through the Lattice*, and in time the Wall of Separation alſo ſhall be broken down. God may correct his Children, but will not diſinherit them.

2 *Premiſe.* Nebuchadnezzar *loſt poſſeſſion of not right to his Crown.* Cant. 2. 9.

Concerning Grace in *us*, (paſſively taken) we do diſtinguiſh between *acts* and *habits* of Grace. No man did ever ſay, that a truly regenerate perſon cannot omit the performance of ſome *acts* of Grace which *formerly* he performed, and is *ſtill* bound to perform: but this we ſay, that the *habits* of Grace are never loſt, or wholly eradicated; and we ſay that thoſe acts of Grace which were interrupted, do abide in their principle, and will again exert themſelves when opportunity is afforded: 'tis one thing to fall *in* the way, another thing to deviate *from* the way: 'tis *one* thing, *ſemel recedere a pietatis tramite*, to take a ſtep awry from the path of holineſs, *another* thing, *ſemper diſcedere a pietatis via*, to forſake the ways of God wholly; a Believer may be guilty of the firſt, not the ſecond.

3 *Premiſe.* Actio pervertitur fides non evertitur, Bernard. de Gratia, & lib.

Again, we diſtinguiſh between a *ſhew* of Grace, and *true* Grace: there are ſeveral inſtances in the Word of God of perſons falling from a *ſhew* of Grace, *Demas*, *Judas*, *Saul*, *Hymeneus*, fell from *hypocriſie* into open *prophaneneſs* and *impiety*: but no ſincere perſon ever fell from true Grace. *Paint* may be ſoon waſht off, when a *healthful*, beautiful complexion will abide: a *Briſtol-ſtone* is ſoon *broken*, but a true *Diamond* will abide the ſmarteſt ſtroke. Many Profeſſors have ſuffered *ſhipwrack as to faith*, and others have loſt their firſt love; but 'tis ſuch faith as had no root, like that of the ſtony-ground, and ſuch love as had no *principle*, 'twas only a paſſion and tranſport, and ſuch *hot* love may be ſoon *cold*. *Common fire* is ſoon *extinct*, but the *fire* of the *Sanctuary* never went *out*.

4 *Premiſe.* Charitas quæ deperditur nunquam fuit vera Charitas, Anſel de Concor. præſcien. & prædeſt. 1 Tim. 1. 19. Rev. 2. 3. Mat. 13. 1.

As

5 *Premiſe.*

As for thoſe Texts that *Bellarmine* urges, that the *Juſt do fall ſeven times a day*, Prov. 24. 16. and that in *many things we offend all*, Jam. 3. 2. the very words themſelves carry a full anſwer to his Objections: for if the juſt *fall* ſeven times a day, 'tis ſuppoſed he *riſes* as often; and if in many things we *offend* all, then 'tis in ſome but an *offence* or a ſtumble, not a final falling: there is difference between foils and falls, and there is difference between falling *into ſin*, and lying *in ſin*; there is difference between *receſſion* from Grace, and *exciſion* of Grace; the *firſt* is poſſible to happen for a time to a Believer, but God will never ſuffer the ſecond to come upon him: for although a Believer may fall, yet he falls only as *Cork* falls into the water, which may for a time be immerſed, but it will riſe again, and get aloft; but an Hypocrite falls as *Lead* into the water, which ſinks and riſes no more. Having premiſed theſe things, I proceed to the Arguments, which evince the perſeverance of all that are effectually called unto Glory.

Vide Aug. de cor. & Grat. cap. 9.

1 *Arg. From the immutability of God's Decree.*

First Argument is from the *immutability* and *unchangeableneſs* of God's *Purpoſes* and *Decrees*. I have already proved that God did from before the foundation of the World decree to make ſome particular perſons the objects of his love, and that theſe perſons were *fore-ordained* of God to be effectually called in *time*, and to be glorified in *eternity*: Now *the gifts and calling of God are* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *without repentance*, ἀμεταμέλητα, ſuch as God *never can* or *will* repent of. There is a neceſſary *connexion* between every *Decree* of God, and its full *execution* and performance: all the *powers* of *Hell* are not able to *break* by *force*, nor all the *ſubtilty* of the *Jeſuites* of *Rome* able to diſſolve or untie by *skill*, that ſtrong and neceſſary connexion of all thoſe *links* of that *Golden Chain* that is drawn forth in that fore-quoted *Rom.* 8. 29, 30. Foreknowledge, or Election, Vocation, Juſtification and Glorification, are *inſeparably* conjoined; ſo that whoever hath hold of *one* of them, hath hold of all; and he that *knoweth one*, *knoweth all*. The Apoſtle in *Rom.* 9. 11. doth fully aſſert that God did exerciſe Sovereign diſcriminating Grace in his eternal Decree of Election; and withal he declares the immutability and unchangeableneſs of that Decree: mark his words: *The Children* (ſaith he) *not being yet born, neither having done good or evil, that the purpoſe of God might ſtand, not of him that works, but of him that calleth, it is ſaid, The elder ſhall ſerve the younger*, &c. God's purpoſe muſt ſtand, μένῃ, muſt remain ſteadfaſt, as *Beza*, or confirmed, as *Caſtalio* tranſlates it: The Decrees of God are compared to Mountains of Braſs, *Zech.* 6. 1. unremoveable, becauſe ſituate in the eternal Will. Conſider the expreſſion uſed by *Samuel*, 1 Sam. 15. 19. *The Strength of Iſrael will not lye nor repent, for he is not as man that he ſhould repent.* God is ſtrength it ſelf, and able to preſerve all his Decrees made in eternity: the word נצח tranſlated ſtrength, may alſo be tranſlated eternity or victory; intimating the victorious power that accompanies eternal Decrees. See *Aug. Confeſſ. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 6. God loves with

Rom. 11. 29.

with an everlaſting love, *Jer.* 31. 3. and he works with an invincible power, *Iſai.* 14. 27.

Secondly, I argue from that ſpecial knowledge that God hath of all thoſe that he hath built ſavingly upon the right foundation, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. God is no fooliſh Builder, to lay the Foundation, and not carry on the Superſtructure; and this is the Apoſtle's own Argument, for the perſeverance of Saints, in 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. where the Apoſtle having obſerved the Apoſtacy of ſome non-elect perſons, adds, *Nevertheleſs the foundation of God ſtands ſure, having this ſeal, The Lord knoweth who are his.* Amongſt many other uſes of a Seal, this is one, that it gives ground of *aſſurance*: Now the Apoſtle therefore uſeth that expreſſion of God's *knowing* of his, that from the conſideration thereof, Believers might have greater confidence, that they being God's *Husbandry*, and God's *Building*, God will never ſuffer them to be *removed*, and that becauſe he *knows* them; which phraſe ſignifies theſe ſix things.

2 *Arg. God's knowledge of the election a ground of perſeverance.*

2 Cor. 3. 11.

1. That God did fore-know them, ſo the word is uſed, *Act.* 15. 18. *Known unto God are all his ways from the beginning of the world*; i. e. God did from eternity fore-know and decree whatever ſhould in time come to paſs: now this is a *ground* of the Saints *perſeverance*, *viz.* That God did fore-know the elect, or decree that all thoſe that he ſhould effectually call, ſhould be *juſtified*, *ſanctified*, and *perſevere* unto Glory, as I have already ſhewn from *Rom.* 8.

For God to know, ſignifies 1. *To fore-know*, Act. 15. 18.

2. To know, ſometime ſignifies to *own* in a peculiar manner, ſo *Amos* 3. 2. God ſpeaking to his people *Iſrael*, ſaith, That *he knew them above all the families on earth.* God knew *Egypt*, and *Babylon*, and *Moab*, and *Edom*, but he did not know them to be his peculiar people above others; but ſo he did *know* Iſrael. Thus thoſe that God hath elected, and *effectually* called, God knows them as his *ſegullah*, his peculiar people, and this is a Seal that they ſhall perſevere.

2 *Peculiarly to own*, Amos 3. 2. סגלה Deut. 26. 24.

3. To know in Scripture, ſometimes ſignifies for God to *approve of*, and to *delight in*, Pſal. 1. 6. *The Lord knows the way of the righteous*: God knows the way of *wicked* men, but ſo as to *curſe* it, it ſhall *periſh*; but God *knows* the way of the *elect*, and of thoſe that are effectually called, ſo as to *approve* of it, and *delight* in it; and this is a Seal, aſſuring them that they ſhall not *periſh*, but *perſevere* in *their way* to Glory.

3. *To approve of, and delight in*, Pſal. 1. 6.

4. To know, is to *overſee* and take *care of*, as a *Shepherd* knows his *Sheep*, ſo *Joh.* 10. 27. *My Sheep hear my voice, and I know them*, that is, I take care of them: Chriſt is ſuch a Shepherd as he himſelf deſcribes, that *if he hath a hundred Sheep, and one of them go aſtray, he leaves the ninety and nine, and goes after the loſt Sheep till he find it*: And this is alſo a ground of a true Believers perſeverance, that if through *non-attendance*, or *inanimadverſion*, or through the violent *perſecution* of roaring Lions or Wolves they ſtray from the Fold, yet Chriſt reduces them again.

4. *To overſee and take care of*, Joh. 10. 27. Luke 15. 4, 5.

5. To

5. To deliver from, or to ſuccour and ſupport in trials, afflictions and temptations, Pſal. 57.7. 1 Cor. 10.13.

5. To know, is to deliver *from*, or at leaſt to ſupport and ſuccour *in* afflictions, *trials* and *temptations*, Pſal. 37.7. *I will be glad* (ſaith David) *and rejoice in thy mercy, for thou haſt conſidered my ſoul in trouble, and haſt known my ſoul in adverſity:* that is, God did both ſupport him *in* affliction, and deliver him from it in his own time. 'Tis an aſſuring Seal of the perſeverance of Believers, that *God will not ſuffer them to be tempted above what they are able: or elſe with the temptation will make a way to eſcape, that they may bear it.*

6. To teach and inſtruct, to enlighten and inform, Gal. 4.9.

Laſtly, for God to know ſometime, is as much as for God to *teach* and *enlighten*; ſo the Apoſtle uſes the phraſe, *Gal.* 4.9. *How is it, that after you have been known of God, ye turn again to weak and beggerly elements?* The *Galatians* had been *taught* of God, but ſeducing Teachers would have brought them to join Jewiſh Ceremonies with Goſpel-Worſhip; now the Apoſtle wonders at the very thought of ſuch a thing, upon this very account, *viz.* becauſe they were *known* of God, *i.e.* ſavingly enlightened by him. 'Tis a moſt *aſſuring* Seal of perſeverance, to have been *rightly enlightened* by the Spirit of God, which is here called, a *being known of him:* ſo that you now ſee the Saints perſeverance grounded, as in the firſt place upon God's election, ſo ſecondly upon his knowing of Believers in a *ſpecial* manner.

Hence it becomes impoſſible to deceive the elect, Matth. 24.24.

3 Arg. Perſeverance grounded upon the verity of God's Covenant. Jer. 32 40.

The third Ground of a true Believer's perſeverance, is from the nature of *God's Covenant.* Perſeverance is one Article of the New Covenant that God hath made with the elect, the terms of which are theſe: *I will*, ſaith God, *make an everlaſting Covenant with them, I will not turn away from them to do them good, but I will put my fear in their hearts, and they ſhall not depart away from me.* God hath abſolutely engaged that elect Believers ſhall not depart from him, that is, not finally, becauſe in an effectual call he will put his fear into their hearts; they may wander, but not depart; they may in ſome acts deviate, but they ſhall not be backſliders in heart; and the reaſon is, becauſe though there may be a tendency in them to turn away from God, yet God ſtands engaged not to turn away from them: hence that expreſſion of God to the Prophet, *They ſay, if a man put away his wife, and ſhe go from him, ſhall he return to her again? ſhall not that Land be greatly polluted? but thou haſt played the harlot with many lovers, yet return unto me, ſaith the Lord.* God will not permit that to be done by *men*, which he may do *himſelf* in this caſe; and the reaſon is, becauſe God can *purge* an adulterous heart, which it is not in the power of man to do: rather than the Marriage-Covenant between Chriſt and a Believer ſhall be diſſolved, God will put forth his *mighty power*, to *make* and *keep* the hearts of Believers *faithful* and *loyal* to him. What a clear and full promiſe of perſeverance is that alſo revealed by Chriſt, in *Joh.* 10.27. *My ſheep hear my voice, I know them, and they follow me; I will give to them eternal life, they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall any man pluck them out of my hand?* Both the Father and Son ſtand engaged by promiſe to preſerve elect Believers

The mercies of God's Covenant are both τὰ ὅσια and τὰ πιστὰ, ſure and holy Conceſſions, ſo Sept. *tranſlate* Iſai. 55.3.

Jer. 31.

God ſaith concerning his peoples ſin, as he ſaid of Iſraels, I have ſeen his ſins, and I will heal them, Iſai. 57.18. Joh. 10.27.

unto

unto life. Another expreſs promiſe of perſeverance we find in 1 *Cor.* 1.8,9. *He ſhall confirm you to the end, that ye may be blameleſs in the day of our Lord Jeſus: God is faithful by whom ye were called unto the fellowſhip of his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* *All* thoſe that are *called* have the promiſe of a moſt *faithful* God to preſerve them *blameleſs*, even to the *day* of the Lord, and therefore they ſhall perſevere.

A fourth Ground of their perſeverance is the ſtability of the Covenant of *Redemption*, or the certain performance of *every promiſe* made *mutually* between the *Father* and the *Son*, *between the Lord of Hoſts and the Branch*, *when the Council of peace was betwixt them both*, mentioned in *Zach.* 6. 12, 13. When the Father and the Son *agreed* about the *Redemption* of faln man, there were many *Articles* of this *Covenant* and *Council of peace* mutually conſented unto, *ſome* of them relating to the *work* of *Redemption it ſelf*, *others* relating to the *reward* of the *Redeemer*, as you may read in *Iſai.* 53. Now this was one promiſe which the Father made unto the Redeemer, *viz.* That he ſhould not die in vain, but *that he ſhould ſee of the travail of his ſoul, and ſhould be ſatisfied*, Verſ. 10. Now *ſhould* true Believers finally *fall*, Chriſt Jeſus ſhould not attain that *ſatisfaction* which is *here* promiſed. The Mother is not ſatisfied with an *abortive* birth; nor would the *Hebrew* women have been *ſatisfied* if their children had been murthered as ſoon as born; neither can Chriſt be willing that thoſe for whom his ſoul was in *agony* ſhould finally *periſh*: The end of Chriſt's ſufferings was not only to bring *forth ſons unto God*, but alſo to *bring thoſe ſons unto Glory*: Now ſhould Chriſt fall ſhort in this latter work, firſt, he could not (according to the Author to the *Hebrews*) be a perfect Captain of Salvation: *For it did become him for whom all things, and by whom all things are, in bringing many ſons unto glory, to make the Captain of Salvation perfect through ſufferings*, Heb. 2. 10. Secondly, Chriſt could not be able in the day of Judgment to ſay as it follows, Verſ. 13. *Behold, I and the children which God hath given me.* But Chriſt is a perfect Saviour, and will at that great day ſay to God as he doth in *John* 17. 6, 12. *Thine they were, and thou gaveſt them me, and they have kept thy word: I have kept them, and none of them is loſt but the ſon of perdition.* In which words there is not only intimated a *Covenant*, and an *Agreement* between the *Father* and the *Son* about the Redemption of the elect, but there is alſo *expreſſed* in them the faithful *diſcharge* of the mutual agreement on both ſides; ſo that not one of thoſe that were God's by *election*, and intruſted in Chriſt's hand *by donation*, ſhall be loſt: *Judas* was therefore a *ſon of perdition*, becauſe given only *externally*, and not *eternally* into Chriſt's hand.

4 *Arg. From the nature of the Covenant of Redemption, and the mutual promiſes made between the Father and the Son.*

The fifth Argument I ſhall uſe is this, If Chriſt did *pray while* he was on *Earth*, and doth *now intercede* in *Heaven*, that all the elect (who are effectually called) may perſevere; then they ſhall perſevere: The Ground of this Argument you have in *John* 11. 42. where Chriſt tells

5 *Arg. Becauſe Chriſt hath prayed that they might perſevere.*

us, *that the Father did hear him always:* ſo that if I prove that Chriſt hath prayed for the perſeverance of Believers, I ſhall *thereby prove* their certain perſeverance. I beſeech you therefore conſider a few Verſes of the 17 Chapter of *John*, and you will find that in Verſe 9. Chriſt expreſly tells us, that He did pray for *all* the elect, and for them only; and Verſe 11. he tells us, that perſeverance was the very matter of the petition which he put up, *Holy Father, keep them through thy Name*; and Verſe 15. he explains how he would have them kept, namely, from the *evil*, or from all evil: And leſt any one ſhould ſay that this prayer was made only for ſome *few* that were then *called*, Chriſt adds, Verſ. 20. that *he prayed for all that ſhould believe, or be effectually called at any time after*; and as perſeverance was fundamentally petitioned for, ſo Chriſt (upon that *Foundation*) doth carry his petitions higher, for Verſe 21. he prays for them that they might attain *a higher degree of union with himſelf*; and Verſe 22. *that they might attain a likeneſs of glory with himſelf*; and Verſe 23. *that they might attain to be loved, as he himſelf was loved of the Father.* Now if all theſe petitions which Chriſt made for all the elect ſhall be infallibly granted, (as I have proved they ſhall from Chriſt's own words) then it doth *neceſſarily follow* that all the elect ſhall *perſevere* unto glory. And yet I ſhall add one thing more for a farther Confirmation of this Argument, *viz.* That as the perſeverance of Believers is ſecured by the *prayer* which Chriſt made for them when he was on Earth, ſo they are yet more ſecured by the *interceſſion* that Chriſt makes for them *now* in *Heaven*. The Author to the *Hebrews* doth moſt fully prove that Chriſt *is able to ſave to the uttermoſt* all that come to God by him, (which he ſhould not be, if all true Believers ſhould not perſevere to glory) by this ſtrong Argument, *Becauſe he ever lives to make interceſſion for them:* as he prayed on *Earth*, ſo he prays in *Heaven*, and will *ever live* to pray for them. I conclude this Argument thus: If Chriſt's *prayer* were *effectual* to keep *Peter* from *final falling*, and to raiſe him up when he *had fallen foully*; if it kept the *habit* of his faith from *failing*, when it failed in the *act*; upon the ſame account the faith of *every* Believer is certainly ſecured (as to its principle) by the prayer which Chriſt *did* make for him on *Earth*, and *now* makes for him in *Heaven*.

See Ameſii Coron. Colloq. Hag.

Ἐκτὸ παντελὲς. Petrus negans Chriſtum non perdidit fidem, ſed peccavit contra ejus confeſſionem. Cor. Lap. in Exod. 32. v. 5.

6. *From the inhabitation and inoperation of the Spirit.*

1 Cor. 3. 16. 2 Cor. 6. 16.

My laſt Argument for the Saints perſeverance ſhall be taken from the conſtant *inhabitation*, and powerful *inoperation* of the Spirit of God *in* and *upon* the hearts of true Believers: *Believers are the Temples of the Holy Ghoſt, and God lives in them, and walks in them.* The Spirit *infuſes* Grace, and he alſo *actuates* Grace in them, and this *preſerves* and *keeps* them from falling. Not the Grace *wrought*, but the Spirit *working* Grace, doth preſerve Grace. Every prudent perſon will ſecure the place of *Habitation*; the Spirit of God dwelling in Believers, &c. doth *ſuper-intend* their minds by a conſtant *inſpection* over them: Chriſt aſ-

Joh. 14. 16, 17. ſures Believers, *That he would pray the Father, and he ſhould give them*

another

another Comforter that ſhould abide with them, viz. *even the Spirit of truth that ſhould dwell in them.* If the Spirit of God abides and dwells in Believers for ever, then they cannot *finally fall*: The work of the Spirit in Believers is an *abiding work*, or an abiding anointing; it abides in *them*, and it cauſes them to abide in *God.* In the great work of Regeneration, the Spirit doth infuſe radicated and fixed habits of Grace, and it works ſuch a principle as continues and abides for ever: Hence it is called an *incorruptible ſeed*, 1 Pet. 1. 23. and a *remaining ſeed*, 1 John 3. 9. Moreover, the Spirit of God is ſaid to eſtabliſh Believers unto Salvation, in as much as it is given as a *ſeal*, and *earneſt thereof into our hearts*, according to 2 Cor. 1. 22, 23. *Now he that eſtabliſheth us with you, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath ſealed us, and given us of his Spirit in our hearts.* Obſerve here, firſt, that all true Believers are confirmed and eſtabliſhed, and therefore they ſhall perſevere: ſecondly, that the way of God's eſtabliſhing them is by God's pouring upon them a holy Unction, or the anointing of his Spirit: thirdly, that this anointing gives ſecurity in the nature of a *Seal*, and an earneſt; a Seal both obliges the Inſurer, and alſo manifeſts the Aſſurance; an earneſt doth ſo much alſo, and more, for it implies alſo ſomething given in preſent poſſeſſion: God working true Grace by his Spirit, ſecures us of Heaven as he ſecured Iſrael of *Canaan*, by giving them *Eſcol*, ſome Cluſters of *Canaan's Vineyards* in the wilderneſs, which was a kind of Livery and Seizon, as when poſſeſſion of an Eſtate is given by a Twig or Rod. God's giving of his Spirit is called *his giving of the firſt-fruits*, Rom. 8. 23. thereby indicating our aſſured full Harveſt, whereof this is an actual part: all thoſe muſt needs be aſſured of Glory, who have a poſſeſſion of Grace; and this ſeems to be the Argument of the very Text, *viz.* If ye do theſe things ye ſhall never fall; why? becauſe *hereby an entrance ſhall be adminiſtred to you into the Everlaſting Kingdom.* Poſſeſſion is the beſt aſſurance, 'tis eleven Points; now by the Spirits indwelling in Believers, they have a kind of prepoſſeſſion of Glory.

See Gregorius de Valv. in primam ſecundæ Aq. q. 3.

Ὁ βεβαιώσας ἡμᾶς, καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς θεός· ὁ καὶ ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος δοὺς ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

Ἀρραβὼν est pars prætii perſoluta Beza in loc.

Ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος.

2 Pet. 1.

It remains now only that I ſpeak to the ſecond general Propoſition included in the Text, *That it is the duty of every Believer to give all diligence to make his calling, election and perſeverance ſure.* This Propoſition being of the nature of an Inference drawn from the former Propoſition, and being alſo rather matter of practice than of controverſie, I ſhall but briefly, and by way of Application ſpeak unto it: yet here alſo the great *Goliah* of the Philiſtines ſtands in our way; for when *Bellarmine* is no more able to maintain the impoſſibility of attaining aſſurance, he then retreats to this ſecond redoubt, and tells us, that no man is bound to gain this aſſurance, although perchance he might poſſibly attain to it if he would labour after it. I muſt with as few words as may be drive him out of this hold, and we ſhall draw towards a concluſion. I ſhall therefore prove, *that it is a Believers duty to give diligence*

2 *Gen. Prop.* 'Tis a Believers duty to give diligence to make his calling, &c. ſure.

Nemo tenetur ad habendam hanc certitudinem, etiamſi forte poſſit habere, Bel. lib. Juſt. 8. Cap. 3.

gence to make his calling, election and perſeverance ſure, from a double neceſſity incumbent upon him.

Neceſſitate præcepti. Heb. 6. 11. 1. 'Tis a Believers duty from the neceſſity of the command: there can be no plainer or more expreſs command than the words in the Text and a parallel place with the Text is that of the Author to the *Hebrews*. We deſire (*i. e.* in God's Name we require) that every one of you do ſhew the ſame diligence to the full aſſurance of hope unto the end. Brethren, I might have uſed it as a ſtrong Argument for the poſſibility of attaining aſſurance, becauſe God hath ſo ſtrictly enjoined us to effect it: for *nemo tenetur ad impoſſibile*, that no man is bound to impoſſibilities, is a true Rule, taking it of natural impoſſibility. Now there is nothing more clear than that we are bound to endeavour after aſſurance, by virtue of God's precept, which is ſo full as that many other duties are therefore enjoined becauſe they are neceſſary means for our attaining aſſurance. Thus we are commanded, 1. To ſearch the Scriptures; 2 Cor. 13. 5. 2. To ſearch and try our ways; 3. To ſearch and examine our hearts. The end of all this ſearching of the Word as the Rule, and of our hearts and lives, as the things to be regulated by the Word, is but that we might come to an aſſured knowledge of the agreement or diſagreement that is between them.

2. Many duties are enjoined Believers, becauſe 'tis ſuppoſed diligence hath been given, and aſſurance thereby attained. Such as theſe a Believer is commanded, 1. To come with boldneſs and humble confidence to the Throne of Grace. 2. To rejoice in the Lord always. 3. To give God glory by believing. 4. To tell others what great things God hath done for their ſouls. 5. To comfort one another, and ſtrengthen the faith of one another; all which duties are commanded, becauſe the attaining of aſſurance is firſt commanded, and that firſt command is ſuppoſed (by theſe other commands) to have been obeyed: for no man Gal. 4. 6. can come in the Spirit of adoption, and (with a filial confidence) cry, *Abba, Father*, who firſt knows not himſelf to be a ſon by the image he bears. No man can rejoice in the Lord as he ought to rejoice, till he Luke 10. 20. knows his name be written in Heaven, becauſe the Law of God is written in his heart. How can a Captive triumph, or a Man in Chains dance? How can an *Hebrew*-ſong be ſung in *Babylon*, in a ſtrange Land? Again, when it is required that we ſhould live in perpetual adoration of Divine Goodneſs, and in admiration of Free Grace, and that we praiſe, and bleſs, and magnifie the Name of God, giving him Glory by believing, this ſuppoſes that we do believe, and alſo that we know we do Neh. 8. 10. believe: For 'tis the joy of the Lord that gives us ſtrength to do his Will, and doth enlarge our hearts to ſpeak good of his Name.

2. *Diligence is neceſſary*, neceſſitate medii. The ſecond Argument, proving it the duty of Believers with diligence to endeavour after aſſurance, is, becauſe this diligence is neceſſary *neceſſitate medii*, as a neceſſary means. Here I deſire you to conſider theſe two things: 1. That diligence is a neceſſary means for attaining aſſurance.

assurance. 2. That assurance is a necessary means for the effecting some ends which we are bound to accomplish; but are such as without a certain knowledge of our interest in God, they are not possibly attained.

1. Diligence is a most proper and necessary means for attaining assurance. Faith of *adherence* (as one says) comes by *hearing*, but Faith of assurance comes not without *doing*. In God's giving first Grace, we are *truly passive*; but *before God causes all Grace to be in us, and to abound*, he makes us active and diligent: both in the *direct* act of Faith and also in the *reflex* act of it, it may be said, that *actu agimur*, we act being acted; yet there is some difference between our *living*, and *moving*, and *having* our *being* in God: for as the Child ows the *first principle* of its life wholly to *God* and its *Parents*, wherein 'tis wholly *passive* in it self, but (*afterwards*) the *exercise* of those principles *depends* upon God's *enabling* of the *Child* to put forth those acts that properly *flow* from a vital principle; so first-principles, or the habits of Grace are (as I have already shewn) infused by God alone, but the *acts* and *exercise* of Grace are from God's *concurse* with *our faculties* and *powers*. We are bidden *to work out our Salvation with fear and trembling*, notwithstanding it be most true *that God works in us both to will and do of his own good pleasure*. You see a just acknowledgment of *God's Grace* may be conjoined with a clear revelation of *man's natural power before conversion*, and of a *Believer's moral power after regeneration*, and both of them enforcing and engaging unto the greatest diligence, even from their conjunction and concurrence: for these things are very *harmonious* in themselves; 'tis man's *ignorance* or *peevishness* that *divides* the things that God hath *conjoined*. Acknowledgment of Free Grace in its *power*, *efficacy*, and *discriminating* prerogative, when *duly* considered, doth most effectually put us upon *diligence*. Men can easily reconcile those two Texts, where in one place 'tis said, the *hand* of the diligent makes rich; in the *other*, the blessing of God maketh rich; men understand these things as they concur in natural things, I think they might as well be understood as relating to spiritual riches, riches of assurance, diligence with God's blessing being a proper means for gaining assurance.

1. *Diligence a means to gain assurance.*

2 Pet. 1. 13.

Prov. 10. 4.
Prov. 10. 22.
Col. 2.

2. Assurance is a most *proper means* for the more speedy attaining many excellent ends, which *without it* are most *difficultly* accomplished: and here I might enumerate many particulars; for indeed there is scarce any *one* act of Grace that can be (in any measure or degree) *so well* exercised by a person *ignorant* of his spiritual estate, as by *him* who *knows* that relation which he *stands* in to God, neither is any duty so well performed *before* assurance, as *after* that God hath *sealed* to a Believer the *pardon* of his sin. But I must mention only *some* consequents of assurance, *so* many as may stop the mouth of that *Rabshaka*, *Bellarmine*, whose *last Argument* against assurance is this, *That 'tis not conve-*

2. *Assurance a proper means helping us to attain more grace.*

Non expedit ut homines certitudinem de gratia propria ordinarie habeant. Bell. lib. 3. de Just. cap.

nient

nient that men attain to assurance ordinarily of the truth of [illegible] *in their hearts*; and his reason is, because *it tends* to *carelessness* and *sloth*. And *Petrus a Soto* saith, That *it is not only most humble, but most safe to doubt of the Grace and favour of God*. For *Confutation* hereof, I shall instance in three effects or consequents of true assurance, which are of great import, but are difficultly obtained by those that want its assurance.

1. A more compleat Victory over the actings of remaining sin and corruption; this is much furthered by assurance. 'Tis with Believers as it was with the *Israelites*, they *bowed down* under the Oppression of *Egypt* so long, as they *despaired* of deliverance; but when God had assured them of his love and favour, and had given them a *promise* of bringing them forth from bondage, a *new spirit* immediately *came upon* them, and they suddenly *vindicated* themselves from slavery: they cast off their *Oppressors Yoke*, and *went forth* to liberty, not leaving one hoof behind them. Thus *despondent* persons, (who nourish their own fears) like *Issachar* may couch down between these *two* burthens, 1. *sight* of guilt, 2. and *sense* of strong corruptions; but when Gospel-grace appears, and a *sight* of the souls interest in the *strength* and *power* of Christ is once manifest, presently the soul *lifts up its head*, and breaks this yoke off from its neck, and bids defiance to its old *lusts*, and *goes forth conquering and to conquer*. Our Adversaries do indeed speak evil of the things they know not, and because they want this experience, that assurance doth most effectually purifie the heart; and are ignorant that he that hath the most assured *hope*, *does* most industriously *endeavour to purifie himself as God is pure*: therefore they blaspheme this most sacred Truth; they deny Scripture; and (were it not for shame) would accuse Christ and his Apostles (*Peter* and *Paul*) for Libertines, as the Pharisees sometimes did. But was it not Christ's common method, *first* to say to afflicted souls, *Your sins are forgiven*, and then *take up thy bed and walk*? And again, did he not *first* say, Thou art made whole, and *then* said, sin no more? Christ's opinion (or rather his certain knowledge) was *this*, that the *sense* of forgiveness was the most *potent* principle of love and obedience; Christ *tells us*, *that* Mary Magdalen *therefore loved much, because much was forgiven her*. If *Paul* understood any thing of Gospel-principles, it was his Doctrine, that the more clear *the Grace of God doth appear*, *the more effectually it doth teach to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and holily in this present world*. Our Adversaries forget that assurance is attainable by *none* but *true* Believers: now 'tis impossible that *true Believers* should turn the *Grace* of God *into wantonness*. We affirm, that this *new name*, and the *white stone*, is never given to any *but those that are partakers of the new nature*, to such as are *regenerate*. God *first* principles the heart with holiness, and *then* smiles upon it; and for a *holy* person to know that he is *so*, can be no occasion to disobedience. I ask, *Who* is more obliged, or *who* feels the obligation to observance *most ef-*

Acts 15.

1 Joh. 3. 6.

Tit. 2. 11.

gently?

ly? The *Son* who *knows* his near relation, and knows his Father loves him; or the *Servant* that hath great reason to *doubt* thereof? God's Spirit *seals* none but those it hath in measure *sanctified*; neither would God reveal his love, but that he *knows the constraining power of it*. Fear is a *weak* and *impotent* principle, in comparison of *love*: the Apostle saith, *The Law was weak*; the terrour of its curse *weakened* and *infeebled* the hands of those that should have obeyed it: but the Gospel-Declaration of Grace is *mighty* and *prevailing*, because it comes in the *power* of love. Terrours may *awaken*, love *enlivens*: terrours may *almost persuade*, love *over persuades*. *Felix* may *tremble*, and remain *unconverted*: *Zacheus* hears of *certain Salvation*, and makes haste to come down, and *receives Christ gladly*. Legal terrours may *move* affections, and *turn* the passions; but they make no *change* upon the will, and therefore there is no *saving* or *through* work effected; (as when a party of Souldiers only *storm the Out-works* of a Garison, they are soon *again* repelled) but the Gospel takes the *heart*, the *main* Fort, upon friendly Articles, and *voluntary surrender*, and the soul becomes a most willing *tributary* and *subject* to its *new* Governour. Fear may force and offer violence, and commit a *rape* upon the heart, but can effect no *Contract* or Marriage-Covenant, for that is wrought only by love, and that in its *clearest evidences* and manifestations. 'Tis true, the Papists (who are great enemies to Marriage) will *here* be ready to object, that *oftentimes* affections cool *after Marriage*, which were strong *before*; and so it may happen *often* a Believer's knowledge of his interest in Christ.

Rom. 8. 3.

Oderint dum metuant *cannot be divided.*

I answer, that the *Apostate Church of Rome* (to which the Spirit of God gives the title of the great Whore, and of the Mother of Fornications and Adulteries both Spiritual and Civil) doth much delight to cast all the blemishes (they can) upon the *state* of Marriage, *civilly* or *spiritually* considered; but more innocent persons do know, that *interest* did never *lessen* love, nor the *knowledge* of interest *abate affection*, but rather *increase it*: all persons find that *relation* hath a strange influence upon men's minds to *endear* those objects that might otherwise be but *little taking*. Sure I am that a Believer's knowledge that his beloved is *his*, and he is *his beloveds*, is found by experience to lay the most *strong* and cogent Obligation upon him to *loyalty* and *faithfulness* unto the the Lord Jesus: for, as to him that believes, Christ is precious; so, to him that *knows* he believes, to him Christ is *so much the more* precious, even the chiefest of ten thousand.

Amat ille non immerito qui amatur sine merito. Amat sine sine qui cognoscit se amatum fuisse a principio, Ber. Ep. 107.

2. As assurance furthers our love to Christ; (and so gives power over sin) so it gives strength to *overcome the world*, and *all* the temptations of it, of what kind soever, be they either, *First*, *on the right hand*, *viz.* the smiles, flatteries, allurements and inticements of the world; Assurance of an interest in God very much facilitates our conquest over all these. The *fore-sight* and prospect of Heaven, carries the soul so *high* in its contemplation of Glory, as when it *looks down* upon worldly enjoyments,

2. *Victory over temptations of the world.*

1. *On the right hand.*

joyments, they appear ſmall, little, and very inconſiderable. Moſes after God had *aſſured* him of his love, and had cauſed his *Glory to paſs before* him, how did he *ſcorn* to be tempted with the bait of being reckoned and accounted the ſon of *Pharaoh*'s daughter? *He refuſed to be called the ſon of Pharaoh's daughter, and choſe rather to ſuffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleaſures of ſin that are but for a ſeaſon, eſteeming the reproaches of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures of Egypt.* Whence aroſe this braveneſs and true greatneſs of mind? The Text tells you, *He had reſpect to the recompence of reward.* He knew the reward was great, and his title to it good. St. *Auguſtine* tells of himſelf, that after he had attained aſſurance of God's love and favour, he was ſo raviſhed therewith, as he could not but cry out with a holy exclamation, *Oh how ſweet is it to be without the worlds ſweets, ſince I enjoy all ſweetneſs in God! Thoſe things that once I was afraid to loſe, I now let go, and want with joy, becauſe hereby I enjoy thee the more.*

Heb. 11. 23.

Aug. lib. Confeſſ. 3. quam ſuave eſt deliciis hiſce carere, &c.

2. *Temptations on the left hand.*

2. As to temptations on the left hand, *viz.* The worlds frowns, threats and perſecutions, how little doth an aſſured perſon regard them? they are all now accounted and conſidered *as light and momentary afflictions*, becauſe they are known *to work a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.* We read of true Believers that *endured the ſpoiling of their* goods with joy; to ſuffer with *patience* to ſome is very *hard*, but to others 'tis *joy*, even when they fall into divers temptations; but who are theſe? the Spirit of God tells us, that they are thoſe *that know within themſelves*; mark, within themſelves, (*i. e.* by inward evidences, and the teſtimony of the Spirit witneſſing with their ſpirits) *that they have a better and more enduring ſubſtance in Heaven*; theſe can both forego and undergo cheerfully whatever God requires of them. Excellent is the ſaying of St. *Cyprian*; *There lives in us*, ſaith he, *the ſtrength and power of an immoveable faith*; *and hence it is that amongſt all the ruines of this tumbling and rolling world, our mind bears up, and our patience always triumphs, becauſe our ſouls are ſure and ſecure in reference to the eternal love of God.*

2 Cor. 4. 16.

Heb. 10. 34.

Viget apud nos ſpei immobilis virtus & firmitas, &c. St. Cyp. Sermone de patientia.

3. Aſſurance of our Salvation procures Victory over the fear of death. *Old Simeon with Chriſt in his arms could pray for a diſmiſſion hence.* He that hath gotten good *evidences* in his *boſom*, and the Spirit's *teſtimony* of the pardon of his ſin ſealed upon his Conſcience, will join with *Simeon* in this his petition. Until aſſurance be attained, 'tis impoſſible but *that men ſhould all their lives long be kept in bondage through the fear of death*: but an aſſured perſon can wiſh for death, and ſay with *Paul*, *Cupio diſſolvi*, I deſire to be diſſolved. Aſſurance carries the ſoul to the top of *Piſgah*, and from thence a Believer (as he hath a general *view* of the *whole Land* of promiſe, ſo by the eye of an aſſuring Faith he) is able to eſpy *his own lot and portion* in Heaven and Glory; and can he be unwilling to go through *Jordan* (or the Chanel of the Grave) to take *poſſeſſion* thereof? As the *leaſt degree* of true Faith takes away the

3. *Over the fear of death.*

Heb. 2. 15.

See 2 Cor. 5. 1. *I know that if this earthly Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a building of God, eternal in the Heavens.*

sting of death, because it takes away *guilt*; so *Plerophory of Faith* breaks the very *teeth* and *jaws* of death, by taking away the *fear* and *dread* of it. When Evidences of an Estate are once sealed and attested, men are not afraid of that *Turf* and *Clod*, which (whilst it defiles their hands) gives them *Livery* and *Seizon* of large Revenues. When a true Believer knows his interest in those *eternal Mansions* of Glory to come, he is not troubled that *his Cottage* of Clay must first be pulled down: The nature of death to a Believer is quite *altered* from what it *was*, and it seems to be *another* thing (in his present apprehension) differing much from what he *once* thought it to be. It *once* appeared only the *wages of sin*, but now it appears as the *reward* of patience: It was once thought the *beginning* of *sorrow*, but now the *end* of *sin*, and the *consummation of grace*. To a *despairing* person death appears like a grim Sergeant haling to prison; to an *assuring person* it acts the part of a *Master of Ceremonies*, who introduces Foreigners into the presence of the great King. Death holds forth a *Crown* to an assured person; it holds forth an *Axe* to a despairing person; such a change doth assurance make. I shall therefore add no more but the words of *Cyprian*, who discoursing of death, hath these words: *Beloved*, saith he, *the Kingdom of Heaven is begun already in us in joy and peace: there is no place left for fear, or doubting, or sorrow; he only can fear death, that is unwilling to go to Christ; and none can be unwilling to go to him, that know they shall reign with him.* Cyprian de mortalitate.

And thus I have *abundantly* shewn *how instrumental* assurance is for the *increase* of sanctification, and *obtaining* a more *compleat* victory over *Sin*, the *World*, and the fear of *Death*; and I have thereby confuted *Bellarmine*'s grand Argument against assurance, as if it *tended* to licentiousness. The rest of his Objections and Arguments I have also sufficiently obviated; so as I hope every *considering* person will be able (from what hath been spoken) to defend the truth, although the *stile* (of necessity) hath been more *concise* than might have been *desired*: yet I hope those that are *intelligent* will be satisfied with the *matter* of Argument therein contained, although I have been forced to *abbreviate* my Discourse. I must make but little other Application, than, 1. To desire you to *change* the *Arguments* by which I have proved *the necessity* of *diligence*, into *Motives* to put you upon the practice: 2. I shall conclude with some necessary Directions for the better attaining to assurance.

Use.

1 *Direction, make it more and more sure in it self.*

1. *Give diligence* to make your calling *more sure* in it *self*, by adding *unto faith, virtue*; *unto virtue, knowledge*; *unto knowledge, temperance*, and the rest of those Graces here mentioned by our Apostle. Although now your *calling* may be *sure* and *saving*, yet it may be *more assured*: the Promises were *sure* before Christ's coming, yet he is said to *confirm* them, and make them *more sure*, Rom. 15. 8. A Believer, the more he grows in Grace, *the more effectual* is his calling made; and the more sure it is *in it self*, the more *easily* may he attain to his assurance of it.

Vocatio etsi primo & per se certa sit, complementum tamen adhuc expectat. Chamier Tom. 3. lib. 13. cap. 15.

The more *effectual* it is, the more *visible and conspicuous* always is a Believers call. *Little* Grace may be *true* Grace, but *little* Grace is next to *no* Grace; and therefore *weak* Grace is *seldom* discerned: just as those *Motes* or *Atoms* (as they are called) which are small *particles* of dust, (and fly abroad in the Air) are *true* Bodies, but they are *invisible* Bodies: thus while *Faith* is but as a *Grain of Mustard-seed*, it may be true,
Luke 13.18. but it will be *hardly* seen. When love to God is (as a small *spark* of fire covered with a *heap* of ashes) smothered with too great a mixture of *sensual* and *carnal* affections, it is not easily discovered or found without much search: but Faith grown up to a *Tree*, and love blown up to a *flame*, cannot be hid, for thus they render themselves most visible and manifest. That poor woman that had lost her δραχμὴν, (her
Luke 15.4. Groat) was forced *to light her Candle, and sweep diligently her house, and to look long* before she found it, because it was but a *dram*, a very *small* piece; had it been a *Talent*, or *Shekel* of the Sanctuary, it would have been more *easily* found: Let the print be *true* and *exact*, yet if *small*, 'tis often not *legible*, especially to *weak* eyes: If you would attain to assurance, labour to make your calling *more* sure in it self, by growing *eminent* in Grace.

2. Direction, make it sure to your selves by special assuring graces.

2. Labour to make it sure to your selves, by attaining *to*, and living *in* the *exercise* of those Graces that are *properly* and more *especially assuring Graces*. The Spirit of God in Scripture hath *declared* that a Believer's *assurance* of Salvation depends upon the exercise of *three* assuring Graces. 1. Πληροφορία συνέσεως, a full assurance of knowledge and understanding. 2. Πληροφορία πίστεως, a full assurance of faith. 3. Πληροφορία τῆς ἐλπίδος, a full assurance of hope.

1. A full assurance of knowledge, Col. 2.2. Ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, εἰς πᾶντα πλοῦτον τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν, &c.

1. Labour for full assurance of knowledge: When St. *Paul* is declaring to the *Colossians*, *how much he desired that the Believers of* Laodicea might have their hearts *comforted* and *assured*, he reveals the way of attaining this, to be by attaining *all riches of full assurance of understanding*; which phrase implies two things: 1. That all those things be known *upon* which a Believers assurance and comforts are *built*; and these fundamentals are many: there are *several* (περιγράφα, or *precognita*, several) things must be *foreknown* and *understood* before assurance can be attained; as, 1. You must labour to know the *way* of Redemption and Salvation by the *Mediation* of Christ. 2. You must know the way of a persons *obtaining an interest* in that Mediation; that is, you must know that *Faith* (effectually owning of Christ as Mediator, and deporting it self towards him as such) doth by virtue of the New Covenant *obtain* an interest in that Mediation. 3. You must know by what *signs* or *evidences* true *saving* Faith may be *distinguished certainly* from *temporary* and *ineffectual* Faith. 4. You must know that these certain evidences are found in your heart and life. 2. Full assurance of knowledge, implies a *clear* and *distinct acknowledgment* of all these, with reference to a Believers *well-built* and *grounded comforts*: *Verba sensus*

There is one more Fundamental of assurance than there is of salvation.

&

intellectus connotant affectum & effectum. Scripture-phrases of *sense* and *knowledge*, imply a *suitable* affection; and also such *effects* as are *proper* and *agreeing*: there must not therefore be only a *speculative* notion, but also an *influential* and *practical* Application of this knowledge for the founding of assurance thereupon: there must not be only γνῶσις but ἐπίγνωσις; not only knowledge, but acknowlegment, as it follows in the same Verse.

2. Labour for full assurance of Faith: Now this implies these four things, (which I must but name, as in the former direction.) 1. Labour for full *assent* unto the truth of Gospel-*revelation*. 2. For full *consent* unto Gospel-*method*, *terms*, *conditions* and *commands*. 3. For full *dependance* upon Gospel-*Grace*. 4. For full *experience* of Gospel-*Obedience*, or the Obedience of *Faith*: All these are included in *that full assurance of Faith*, wherewith the Apostle exhorts Believers *to draw near to God*, Heb.10.22. and every one of these acts of Faith must be attained and put in practice before assurance can be attained. 2. *Full assurance of faith.* Heb.10.22.

3. Labour for full assurance of hope. And this supposes two things: First, an actual explicite considering of the grounds of our hope, or a laying a good foundation: all saving hope is rational and well-built. Hopes *Anchor* (in a Believer) holds not by the strength of a *Spider's Web*, as the Hypocrites hope doth; but it holds by the strength of a three-fold Cord, not easily broken; it holds by the evidence of, 1. Testimony, 2. Sense, and 3. Reason. *Bellarmine* (fondly adhering to the Philosophical definition of hope, and) departing from the Scriptural use and acceptation of the word hope, (which is the ground of many errours in the Church of *Rome*) denies that *reason* and *hope* can consist together; and consequently denies also that there is any such thing as *full assurance of hope*, but when he is urged with that plain Text in *Heb. 6. 11. where Believers are exhorted to give diligence for attaining full assurance of hope*, (which supposeth that a full assured hope is in the first place built upon good evidence and proof.) The Jesuite in answer to this, doth most *egregiously* trifle, and doth nonsensically *distinguish* between the certainty of the *will* in *opposition* to the certainty of the understanding; although every *Tyro* knows, that the *will* is no subject of *certainty*, nor can there be any *certainty* of *will separate from* the certainty of the *understanding*: and yet more ridiculous is the Jesuites Argument, when he tells us, that *what* we have *reason* to hope for, we do not *hope* for it, but *expect* it: the folly of which distinction, between hope and expectation) I need not say any thing further to it, than to assure you, that the Apostle *Peter* was wholly ignorant of *Bellarmine*'s Logick, when he exhorts Believer's to be ready to give λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, *a reason of the hope that was in them.* But, Secondly, the phrase (*full assurance of hope*) supposes an actual building of our hope upon these good grounds, or an actual conclusion from rational principles, that we are pardoned, and shall be saved: 'tis one thing to consider 3. *Full assurance of hope*, Heb.6.11. Duplex est certitudo, alia voluntatis, alia intellectus: & videtur non posse certitudinem intellectus cum spe convenire, quia quod scimus nos habituros non speramus, sed expectamus, Bell. lib. 13. de Just. cap.11. 1 Pet.3.15.

consider the *grounds* of such a conclusion, another thing to *conclude* actually from those grounds. Assured hope (as it is accompanied with rational evidences, so) 'tis accompanied with right use of right reason to draw the inference: weak hope sometimes (acts as Children will do) it *grants* the *premises*, and yet *denies* the *conclusion*; *but strong hope* is accompanied with a full power to *infer* the *assured* conclusion from those *assured premises*, which those afore-named assuring Graces did lay down. *Knowledge* saith, Whoever believes, shall be saved; *Faith* saith, *Peter* doth believe, therefore Hope saith *Peter* shall be saved. And this Hope is that which will never make ashamed, because hereby the love of God is shed abroad more abundantly in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto us, *Rom.* 5. 5. *Let every man* therefore thus *prove his own work, and then he shall have rejoycing in himself, and not in another.*

Dicit fides parata sunt magna dicit spes mihi ista servantur. Bernard. Serm. 50.

Gal. 6. 4.

SER-

SERMON XIX.

Of Indulgences.

Heb. X. 14.

For by one Offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified.

THE Apoſtle gives the Reaſon, why Chriſt hath now no more Offering to make, no more Suffering to endure, *For,*] *i. e.* becauſe, *by one Offering,*] i. e. one *in ſpecie*, in oppoſition to the four kinds of Legal Oblations before mentioned; and one *in numero*, in oppoſition to the repeating of them every year. *q. d.* By Chriſts once offering of himſelf, *he hath perfected,*] *i. e.* all things are conſummate, there remains nothing to be done, for the ſatisfying Divine Juſtice, and our Reconciliation with God. Chriſt hath once ſatisfied, and that *for ever,*] *i. e.* to the end of the World, and that which ſhall be of value to Eternity: plainly, Chriſt by his Death hath compleatly done the work once for all, *for them that are ſanctified*;] *i. e.* either thoſe that are ſeparated from the world in Gods Purpoſe and Decree, plainly, the Elect; or *them that are ſanctified,*] i.e. thoſe that are renewed by Grace, and conſecrated to be Veſſels of Honour unto God. In ſhort, Chriſt hath not ſo purchaſed Remiſſion of ſins, as to leave ſome Satisfaction to be made by themſelves, or others; No, he hath perfectly ſatisfied for them, and perfectly expiated all their ſins. Which if ſo, then from this, as well as from other Scriptures, fairly reſults this Propoſition: That,

Papal Indulgences are the worſt of Cheats, and abominably injurious to Chriſt and Chriſtians.

My work here, is to rake in the very Sink of Papal filthiness. There's no head of Divinity that is not mischievously hurt by this putrid Phisse. 'Twas not without Gods singular Providence, that the detecting the Pageantry of that Flesh-pleasing Religion, began here; for herein their *seeming* tender mercies are *real cruelties*.

To evidence what I assert, I shall in my poor manner endeavour, 1. To shew you what the Indulgences are which we justly condemn: 2. The unsound Hypotheses upon which they stand: 3. Demolish the main Thesis: And, 4. Raise some profitable Instructions above exception.

I. Let's begin with the Name and Definition of Indulgences, which (to pass by more than (*a*) thirty different Opinions among themselves,) I shall give you in *Bellarmines* own words; after he hath, like a wary Champion, attempted to reconcile, or excuse his own dissenting party, (*b*) in the close of his eighth Chapter, he gives us this entire Definition, viz. *Indulgence is a judicial Absolution from the Guilt of Punishment, owing to God, in the penitentiary Court, given over and above the Sacrament, by the Application of the Satisfactions which are contained in the Treasure of the Church.* He had before told us, (*c*) that the *Church*, and the *Schools*, call Indulgences the *Remissions of Punishment*, which often remain to be endured after the *remission of faults*, and Reconciliation obtained in the Sacrament of Penance; which Pardons the Popes use to grant, at certain times, and not without some just and reasonable cause, out of their Fatherly gentleness, and condescension towards their Children, pitying their infirmity. This is his, and I'le at present wave any interfering description. Let's then examine the *Hypotheses* of this profitable structure.

a *Voet.* Select. disp. part secund. p. 287. Sect. 2.

b *Bellarm.* Disput. Lugd. 1599. Tom. 3. de indulgen. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 24.

c Id. c. 1. p. 9.

II. The unsound *hypotheses* (or suppositions,) upon which they build this profitable Structure, are such as these: I'le name four of them.

1. That when the *fault* is pardoned, the *punishment* is not pardoned, but there remains an Obligation to punishment, which is changed from Eternal to Temporal, for which God must be satisfied, either by patient bearing his strokes, or by undergoing the Penance injoyned by the Priest, or by laborious works freely undertaken, such as Prayers, Fasting, and Alms; or by Indulgences.

Now the Quagmire-Foundation of this Distinction may thus appear, both by Testimony, by Reason, and (which is more than both these) by Scripture: I need but touch upon each, it being done more largely by a better hand; and therefore I will produce but one Testimony, and that is of the Archbishop of *Spalatro*: "In Pardon to distinguish (*d*) between Fault "and Punishment, so as to separate them, is a most vain thing, and not "to be admitted, especially in respect of God.

d *Marc. Ant.* de Dominis, de Rep. Eccl. lib. 5. c. 8. n. 1.

For reasons, "'Tis against the Nature (*e*) of the thing, that there "should be Punishment where there is no Fault, take away the Cause "and the Effect must cease. What *Bellarmine* saith, that the House will "stand,

e *Fran. Turretin.* de Satisfac. Chr. perfec. p. 230. n. 24. & seqq.

"stand, when the Carpenter that built it is dead, doth not infringe what "we affirm; for we speak here of a Meritorious and Moral, not of an "Efficient and Physical Cause. Wheras it is further said, A King may "pardon a Malefactor, and yet enjoyn him to make satisfaction; I an-"swer, The King and the party offended are different persons, the King "may not give away anothers right, we must not confound the Court of "Heaven and the Court of Earth. I might adde, 'tis against the ordina-"ry manner of speech, to say a Judge pardoneth a Malefactor, whom he "punisheth. 'Tis against the Justice of God to punish one sin twice. 'Tis "against the Mercy of God, to be reconcil'd to a sinner, and to tor-"ment him. But beyond all this, 'tis against the Practice of Christ; what "Temporal punishment did Christ lay upon (*f*) *Mary Magdalen*, upon "(*g*) the Paralytick, the (*h*) great Debtour.

f Luk. 7. 48.
g Mat. 9. 2.
h Mat. 18. 24.
i *Voet.* ibid. p. 289.

2. A second false *hypothesis* is this: One (*i*) Righteous man may satisfie for another, and there are some that need no satisfaction for themselves, and therefore theirs may go for others. *e. g.* If *Peter* fast for *Paul*, then *Paul* need not fast, but God pardons him the punishment, which he should have satisfied for by fasting, *&c.* The groundlesness of this Hypothesis may be thus evidenced.

Jesus Christ hath perfectly satisfied for our sins, and therefore men are not bound to satisfie in part for themselves; (*k*) Christ is *the Propitiation*, (*l*) *our Redemption.* (*m*) *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.* I need name no other Text than that I am discoursing of: (*n*) *By one Offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.* To say, Christ satisfied, that our Satisfactions might be accepted, and ours depends upon his, (*o*) this is to illude Scripture, *q. d.* Christ once satisfied, that we might alwayes satisfie, Christ perfectly satisfied For us, that he might imperfectly satisfie In us; Christ hath satisfied for Eternal punishments, but doth satisfie for Temporal when Believers themselves satisfie. O excellent way of answering! Again, if men must in part satisfie for their sins, then they are not freely pardoned; but how easie is it to multiply expres's Scriptures; (*p*) take notice but of one Epistle: *Justified freely by his Grace. To him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of Grace but of Debt. If by Grace, then it is no more of Works. &c.* Now if none can satisfie for themselves, then they cannot satisfie for others. (*q*) *If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thy self; but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it.* But, should we suppose what can no way be granted, how can they speak of the Communication of mens good Works, while they explode the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, and scornfully call it a putatitious Justification? But more of this in the next.

k 1 Joh. 2. 2.
l 1 Cor. 1. 30.
m 2 Cor. 5. 19.
n Heb. 10. 14.
o *Ant. Sadeel.* de ver. pec. rem. p. (mihi) 97, &c.
p Rom. 3. 24. 4. 4. 11. 6.
q Prov. 9. 12.

3. A third absurd *hypothesis* is this, That the superfluous satisfactions of Christ, and eminent Saints, are laid up in a Treasury, to be laid out for those that want.

The absurdity of this is manifest more wayes than I have time to

mention, (r) beside the absurdity of Parcelling out the death of Christ; to apply one part of it to one use, and another part to another use; whereas all and every part of it is offered and applyed to every Believer; 'Tis further absurd to divide that which is sufficient, from that which is superfluous, when what is infinite is indivisible; and to say, that one drop of the Blood of Christ, is sufficient for the saving of a thousand Worlds, and to reckon all the rest superfluous, and not so much as one person saved by it, that would not have been saved without it, what can be more absurd and blasphemous? I would further enquire, whether under the Old Testament, Believers were bound to satisfie God for Temporal punishments? if they were, let them prove it; if they were not, then God dealt more mercifully with them under the Old Testament, than with Believers under the New; and the Satisfaction of Christ not exhibited, is more efficacious than since his exhibition. Once more, if the Satisfaction of Christ be more than enough, what need the addition of Humane Satisfactions? they say, lest they should be in vain. So then, 'tis no matter though Christs Satisfaction be in vain, Saints must not lose their glory; 'tis no matter with them though Christ lose his. In their account, Christ and Saints must share the work of Redemption between them; Saints must be our Priests, our Sureties, we must believe in them, and place our hope in their Satisfactions; but before we do so, 'tis adviseable, to solve this Doubt, Whether the Treasury of Saints superfluous Satisfactions be Infinite or Finite? if Infinite, then they are sufficient to redeem the World, which I think none hath impudence to affirm; if Finite, what security may we have, ere we part with our Money, that the Treasury is not exhausted, upon the large Grants already made? but they'l tell them the Bank is inexhaustible; In the next place therefore let's consult the Treasurer.

(r) *Plac. Thes. Salm. part. 2. p. 72. & seqq.*

4. The fourth tottering *hypothesis* is this, That the Pope hath the chief power of dispensing this Treasury to those members that need it.

Though I might turn off this with that trite Maxim, That which hath no Being, hath no Accidents; if there be no such Treasury, there need be no controversie about the dispensing of it; and though I might bespeak them to agree among themselves, whether hath greater power, the Pope or a Council, before they quarrel with us about what themselves are not agreed: And though I may well suppose, that the Popes Supremacy is already confuted in this Exercise; but to let pass all this, (s) what a fair Divident do they make of the Satisfaction of Christ, while they allow every Priest to dispose of it for the pardon of *faults*, and of *eternal* punishments, but reserve the disposal of that part of it to the Pope, whereby to pardon *temporal* punishments? How egregiously also do they trifle, while they distinguish between *Satisfaction*, and the *Payment* of Satisfaction: Satisfaction they say, was made by Christ and Saints, but the payment of it is by the Pope; that was done long since, this is still in doing,

(s) *Thes. Salm. ibid. p. 81, &c.*

doing; as if the satisfaction of Christ were like a summe of Money layd up in a Chest, to be layd out upon occasion: Whereas we know no other Gospel-treasury, but what is dispensed by the Spirit of God, by the Word and Sacraments. (*t*) It is the *Gospel that is the power of God unto Salvation, to every one that believeth,*— and *Therein is the Righteousness of God revealed.* But I shall speak more to this in my next Attempt to overturn their *main* Thesis, which is this. † Rom. 1. 16, 17

That the Pope through the fulness of Apostolical power, may grant a most full Pardon by Indulgences: This is express'd most fully by *Clement* the sixt, (*u*) who speaketh thus: "Of that infinite Treasure that "is obtained for the Church Militant, God would not have it to be laid "up in a Napkin, or hid in a Field, but hath committed it to *Peter*, that "bears the Keyes of Heaven, and to his Successor-Vicars on Earth, "to be wholsomely dispensed upon fit and reasonable Causes, sometimes "for the total, sometimes for the partial Remission of temporal Punish-"ments, both generally and specially due for Sins, to be mercifully ap-"plyed to the truely penitent, and confess'd. a Decret. Grat. Tom. 2. extrav. com. lib. 5. c. 2. p. 352.

In the Anatomy of this Thesis, I shall endeavour to discover these things, *viz.* 1. The *falseness* of it; 2. The *Novelty* of it; 3. The *Contradictions* in it; 4. The *Cheats* of it; 5. It's *Injuriousness* to Christ; 6. Its *Mischief* to Christians.

First, To convince you of the *falseness* of this Position, I shall first give you plain Scripture-proof, That there's no pardon of sin but by the Mercy of God, *through the Blood* of Christ, received by Faith. † *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his Grace.* (*x*) *Being justified by Faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.* (*y*) *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died,* &c. Many more Texts might be alleadged, but I had rather say onely what is enough, than all. But our Adversaries pretend also to Scripture-warrant, though *Durand* (*z*) confesseth, that concerning Indulgences there can but little be said upon certainty, because the Scripture doth not speak expressely of them; for that which is said to *Peter, Mat.* 16. 18. *I will give unto thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt binde,* &c. is to be understood of the power given unto him in the Court of Pœnance, and it is not clear that it ought to be understood of the granting Indulgences: But *Bellarmine* saith, (*a*) "Although Indulgences be not warrant-"ed by particular Scripture, yet they are in general by the power of "the Keyes,---- and they may be warranted by Divine Authority, known "by Tradition of the Apostles: (By the way, let me observe, I do not remember, that ever I read any thing in their Authors about the Popes power in any kind, but this Text is press'd into the service of their design, though ordinarily, to as little purpose as any Text in the Bible,) but Scriptures they bring, le'ts examine them a little. They argue from † Ephes. 1. 7. x Rom. 5. 1. y Rom. 8. 33, 34. z *Durand.* l. 4. dist. 20. q. 3. p. 791. a de indulg. l. 2. c. 10. p. 46.

those

those words of the Apostle, (*b*) ..... *ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him*, &c. in short, The Apostle gave Indulgence, so may the Pope. There's enough in the Text to answer their Allegation. *e.g.* 1. *Paul* never limited a time for his Repentance, that it must be so many dayes or years. 2. *Paul* took no price to pay his Debt out of the *Corinthians* Works of Supererogation. 3. The Penitent gave no Money for his Indulgence. And, 4. Which is more than all the rest, he saith *ver.* 10. *To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also.* This is no way to be endured, (*c*) that the Pope hath no more power to forgive any thing than other Priests; I doubt not, but rather than yield that, they'l let go that Text. Another Text they urge, is, (*d*) ..... *my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his Bodyes sake, which is the Church.* Upon which they say, that *Paul* satisfied for the sins of other Believers, and by this means did contribute to the enriching the Churches Treasury of Satisfactions, which the Pope disposeth of by Indulgences: But this is presupposing their Opinion, not proving of it. They grant our Exposition of the Text to be right, (*e*) 1. That *Pauls* Afflictions are the Afflictions of Christ, *i. e.* he suffered them for Christ, for the Name of the Lord. 2. They made up the last part of the Apostles task, being the remainder of the Afflictions he had to sustain. 3. They contain an illustrious Evidence of his gratitude towards the Lord, that as Christ had suffered for his Salvation, he suffered in his order for the glory of his gracious Master. So that here's not a word of Satisfactions, or Treasury, or Indulgences. Another Text they urge is, (*f*) *that your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want*, q. d. The Church of *Jerusalem* was poor, and abounded in Merit, the Church of *Corimb* was rich and wanted Merit; take but the plain meaning of the Text, and that will rescue it from such an abuse: The *Corinthians* received the Gospel from some of the *Jewish* Church, and therefore they ought to relieve their Necessities. Besides their wresting of Scripture, they argue from that Article of the Creed, *The Communion of Saints*, therefore those that neither do, nor suffer what they ought for themselves, are to be supplyed out of what others have done and suffered more than they need. Is not this a Consequence of the largest size? may they not by such arguing prove every thing out of any thing? Briefly, the Church is called *a Communion of Saints*; because, 1. They are all Members of one Mystical Body. 2. All the Benefits of Christ are communicated to every Believer, they are all called, justified, sanctified, saved. 3. They are to do all Offices of Charity one for another, while in this world; but what's all this to works of Supererogation? Let this suffice for this first particular, and the rather, because the proof of the rest will also prove this. Therefore,

(*b*) 2 Cor. 2. 7. &c.

(*c*) *Chem.* exam. conc. Trid. p. 714. &c.

(*d*) Col. 1. 24.

(*e*) *Daille in loc.* p. 120, 121.

(*f*) 2 Cor. 8. 14.

Secondly, Indulgences are a *Novelty*; the ancient Church neither knew nor practised any such thing. That they may not say we slander them,

them, hear their own Authors. *Cajetan* who was employed both as *Legat* and *Champion* against *Luther* begins thus: (*g*) "If certainty could "be had concerning the beginning of Indulgences, 'twould help us to "search out the truth; but because no written Authority, either of the "holy Scripture, nor of the ancient *Greek* or *Latine* Doctors, hath "brought this to our knowledge; but this onely, from three hundred "years, 'tis written concerning the ancient Fathers, that blessed *Gregory* "instituted the Stationary Indulgences, *&c.* Which should we grant, (though let them tell us where to find it in his Writings) 'twould not prove them very ancient. And *Reffensis* himself, as that *Italian* quotes him, (for I have him not by me) acknowledgeth, (*h*) That till people were frighted with (the Bug-bear of) Purgatory, no body minded Indulgences, and that he likewise acknowledgeth to be but of late years. To convince those of Novelty who slander us with it, I'le give you a brief Historical account of them, how they crept in, and to what a monstrous height they rose, till they were so top-heavy, that their fall broke off several branches of that *Tree* (*i*) which overspread the Western Churches.

g Cajet. opusc. Tom. 1. Tract. 15. c. 1. p. 46.

h Polyd. Virgil. de rerum invent. lib. 8. c. 1. p. (mihi) 613.

i Dan. 4. 11. &c.

The Discipline of the ancient Church was such, that they did neither lightly nor suddenly re-admit unto Communion those that denyed the Faith, or sacrificed to Idols in time of persecution, or those that at any time fell into Heresie, or any other scandalous wickedness; till the Church was satisfied in the truth of their Repentance, to evidence which, they required such publick, visible testimonies, such as they judged might most probably speak the grief of their heart for sin, the seriousness of their desire of Reconciliation, and their full purpose of amendment. The manner of their Repentance was thus, as (*k*) *Nicephorus* relates it: "After 'twas look'd upon as burdensome for the Offender to confess his "fault publickly as upon a Theater, they chose a Minister that was holy, "prudent, and secret, to whom those that had offended might open their "case, and receive directions what to do, that their sin might be par-"doned. The *Novatians* took no care of this matter, for they refused "to communicate with those that denyed the Faith in the persecution of "*Decius*; and 'tis said, *This Rite was instituted for their sake*, that they "might be restored upon their Repentance. There was a certain place "appointed for the Penitents, where they stood with a dejected counte-"nance, greatly bewailing their sin, till what they might not partake of, "was ended, and then they threw themselves at his feet that administred; "then he that was appointed to direct them, ran to them, and mourn-"ing with them, lay down upon the ground, and the whole multitude of "the Church stood about them, with many tears lamenting over them; "then the Minister rose up, and bade the Penitents to rise, and praying "for them as the matter required, dismissed them; then every one betook "himself to what was enjoyned him, to macerate themselves by Fastings, "and Watchings, and frequent Prayers, and Abstinence from Delights;

k Niceph. hist. Eccles. lib. 12. c. 28. p. 279. & seqq.

"which

"which when they had performed, they were received into Communion; "this they did to keep the Ordinances pure, and the Church from Re- "proach; but I think (saith he) that the Church is fallen from that an- "cient, venerable Gravity, and hath by little and little departed from "that accurate Discipline. The Church prescribed Rules for Repentance according to the variety of Offences, (*l*) some for the space of several dayes, others for several years, and others during life, allowing the Bishop to abate or adde to the time enjoyned, as he saw occasion. (*m*) 'Twas judged convenient in all cases to try their Repentance, and if the Penitents, did by their fear, and patience, and tears, and good works, demonstrate the unfeignedness of their Conversion, they were to be more gently dealt with. (*n*) But they, as wise Physicians, still imposed fit remedies, *viz.* Humbling Exercises to the Vain glorious; Silence to the Bablers; Watching to the Sluggards; hard Labour to the Slothfull; Fasting to the Gluttonous, *&c.* And in those things that were imposed, (*o*) we are not so much to consider the Length of the Time, as the Depth of the Grief, such as may *satisfie the Church*, (pray mark that, it is the Church, in the truth of their Repentance,) not Gods Justice, so that they might challenge a Pardon. (*p*) We are firmly to believe, that the purging away of sin is done by the Blood of Christ, through the greatness of Gods Mercy, and the multitude of his Compassions. But they were onely enormous sinners, upon whom the ancient Church imposed severities, to evidence the truth of their Repentance; let *Augustine* speak for all, (*q*) who mentions a threefold Repentance: "The first before (*r*) Bap- "tism, which is Conversion, when a man repents of his former Course "of Life, and gives up himself to live in Newness of Life, and upon "these they imposed no Ecclesiastical Censures. The second was, (*s*) a "daily Repentance; and for sins of daily incursion, we are taught to "pray, *Forgive us our Trespasses, &c.* of these the Church took no no- "tice. But there's a (*t*) more grievous and mournfull Repentance, in the "managing of which, Offenders are properly call'd Penitents; this is a "grievous thing, but that the Almighty Physician can cure such; but "O my beloved (*saith he*) let no man propose this kind of Repentance "unto himself; if he have fallen, let him not despair, but let no man "venture upon sin in hopes of Repentance. So that you may see, that whoever will be at the pains to compare the Satisfactions of the Papists with the Satisfactions of the Ancients, they will find them far different. In short, (*u*) "They never used them as necessary for the Pardon of sin, "neither did they hold, that these Satisfactions must be made in this "Life, or endured in Purgatory, which two things if you take away, "you overthrow the Tables of Indulgence-sellers; but they enjoyned "them, 1. That the Name of God might not be blasphemed among "the Heathen, as if the Church were a Receptacle of Belialists, "where they might sin with Impunity. 2. That they might not par- "take of other mens Sins. 3. That others might not be infected, for "sin

l *Decret. Gratian.* Tom. 2. Canon pœnit. p. 2053. & seqq. *Concil. Ancyra.* can. 5 6, 7, 20, 21, 22, &c. in *Concil. Bin. Edit.* Tom. 1. p. 275. et seqq.

m *Concil. Nicæn.* Can. 12, 13. ibid. p. 343.

n *Basil.* Tom. 2. Reg. fus. disput. resp. ad inter. 50. p. 601.

o *August.* Enchirid. cap. 65. Tom. (mihi) 3. p. 230.

p *Basil* ibid Reg. brev. resp. ad inter. 10. p. 617.

q *Aug.* de utilipœni ent. Tom. 9 p. 1284. & seqq.

r c. 1.

s c. 3.

t c. 3.

u *Chem. Exam. Conc. Trid.* p. 725. & seqq.

"sin is a catching Disease. 4. That Offenders might be more feelingly "convinced of the greatness of their sin. 5. That they might do what "was possible to pull up sin by the roots, &c. Whereas the Papists now, as the degenerate Church of *Israel* formerly. † *They eat up the sin of my People, and they set their heart on their iniquity.* The Patrons of Indulgences look at their gain; the Ancients, when they absolved their Penitents, exhorted them to sin no more, but to bring forth fruits worthy of amendment of Life, they put them upon the exercise of the contrary Vertues, but there's nothing of this in Papal Indulgences. In a word, the Ancients carryed on a design of *Heavenly* Interest in their Severities, and the Papists of *Earthly* in their Indulgences. But the Severities of the Ancients were by degrees mollified. Our learned Countrey man gives us the Canons of a Council, in the year 786. where in the last Canon 'tis decreed, (x) *That if any one dyed without Penance and Confession, he should not be at all prayed for.* (where then were Indulgences as since granted?) But he gives us the Canon of another Council, in the year 967. *Where the Council closeth the Penitential Canons with* (y) *four concerning the Penance of Noble-men,* (*they say expressely in the last Canon, that poor men are not to have any such priviledge,*) *there they give this direction for him that is enjoyned Seven years Fasting: Let him* (*say they*) *for three dayes have twelve Companions to fast with him,* i.e. *to eat nothing but Bread and Water, and Herbs, and let him somewhere else get seven times one hundred and twenty men, to fast every one for him for those three dayes, and so he will fast so many fasting dayes as there are in the whole seven years.* But if yet this be too much, they may have Relief by the Provision before made (z) for those that are sick; is it not enough to make a Great man sick, to put him upon three dayes Fasting? which if it do, *for one peny, he may buy off a dayes Fasting, and for thirty shillings a years Fasting.* Is not this fair? But yet this comes not neer the later Markets. But I must not multiply particulars; when they had Churches to build, Hospitals to endow, Bridges to repair, or the like, then Indulgences were granted to fetch in Money: And even then while these good works were proposed, *Gregory* the 9th (a) decrees, *That the Alms-gatherers appointed, be modest and discreet persons, that they lodge not in Taverns or unfitting places, that they be not profuse in their Expences,* &c. *Because* (saith he, pray mark his words,) *by the indiscreet and superfluous Indulgences, which some are not afraid to grant, the Keyes of the Church are contemned, and pœnitential Satisfaction is enervated*; and therefore he set limits to the granting of them. But notwithstanding all the little checks they met with, they were more freely granted in the year of *Jubile*. In the year 1300. (b) *Boniface* the 8th, instituted a Jubile every Hundredth year, wherein he granted not only a full, but a *most* full pardon of all sins, to all those that in such a time shall visit the Churches of the Prince of the Apostles at *Rome*. To me the beginning of the Bull seems considerable, that

† Hos. 4. 8.

x Sir Hen. Spel. Concil. Brit. in conc. Calchuth. can. 20. p. 300.

y Idem Canones dati sub Edgaro Rege. p. 474. &c.

z Ibid. can. 18. p. 473.

a Decret. Grat. Tom. 3. Decret. Greg. l. 5. Tit. 38. c. 14. p. 1874.

b Bullar. Mag. Tom. 1. p. 204.

grounds it upon a *Report* that great Indulgences were granted (though no body knows *when* nor *where*) to the Visitors of those Churches. Well, but though there never was any such thing before, yet now this easie way of Pardon is broach'd, 'tis pity the time should be so seldom; *Clement* the sixt (*c*) therefore in the year 1350. upon the prayers of the People of *Rome*, reduced the Jubile to every Fiftyeth year, and for so doing, he doth not go upon Report, but founds it upon the Law of *Moses*. (*d*) *Urbane* the sixt, reduced it to Thirty three years; and *Paul* the second (*e*) gives the Reason of it, *viz.* he providently considered, men do not live so long as formerly, and desired that very many more might receive benefit by them, *&c.* which when he hath done, as also how that Reduction was confirmed by *Martin* the fifth, and *Nicholas* the Fifth, he then expresseth his greater Kindness in reducing the Jubile to every 25th year; and *Alexander* the sixth, (*f*) in the year 1500. enlarged the Jubile to those that could not, or neglected to come to *Rome*. And thus I have (though with omiting more than I have express'd) brought them down to *Leo* the 10th, (*g*) who exercised such an excessive power in this matter, that there is not (saith *Ranchin*) a good Catholick but is sorry for it. Take the matter of fact from that excellent Historian (*h*) *Thuanus*, who wrote onely the History of his own time, and therefore might well be more exact. "In the year 1515. *Leo* the tenth, a "man giving himself to all Licentiousness, by the instigation of Cardinal "*Lorenzo Puccio*, a turbulent man, to whom he ascribed too much, that "he might from all parts scrape up Money for his vast Expences, he sent "his Bulls of Indulgences through all the Kingdoms of the (Papal) Chri-"stian World, wherein he promised the expiation of all sins, and Eter-"nal Life; and there was a price set what every one should pay, ac-"cording to the grievousness of his Sin. To which end he appointed Col-"lectors and Treasuries throughout the Provinces; adding to them, "Preachers to recommend to the People the greatness of the Benefit: "these by Sermons artificially composed, and by Pamphlets openly pub-"lished, immoderately extolled the Efficacy of these Indulgences. These "Bulls were executed with too much Licentiousness in many places, but "especially in *Germany*; where those that farmed them from the Pope, "did lavish out their power of drawing Souls out of Purgatory, shame-"lessly spending it every day in Whore-houses and Taverns, at Dice, and "most filthy uses. I shall forbear to insist upon the abominable Expressi-ons of those that preach'd up these Indulgences, such as this, *viz. That there is no sin so great, but that if a man should (which is impossible) deflour the Mother of God, he might by Indulgences be pardoned both Fault and Punishment.* *Chemnitius* (*i*) mentions several stories, to whom I referre you; and shall somewhat more largely aquaint you with the very words of some of the Hundred Grievances of the Princes of the *Roman* Empire, assembled at *Noremberg*, in the Years 1522, and 1523. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth Grievances, are unto the Title of *The Burdens*

c *Ciacon. vit. Pont.* p. 903.

d Idem p. 998.

e *Bullar. mag.* Tom. 1. p. 401, 402.

f *Ciacon. vit. Pontif.* p. 1343.

g *Review of the Council of Trent.* l. 5. c. 1. p. 249.

h *Thuan. histor.* l. 1. p. 13.

i *Chem. Exam. Conc. Trid.* p. 744, 745.

of

of Papal Indulgences. (k) "Their third Grievance is about the Increase "of the intolerable burden of Indulgences, when under the shew of Piety, "for the Building of Churches, or an Expedition against the *Turks*, the "Popes suck the Marrow of their Estates; and which heightens the Im- "posture, by their hireling Cryers and Preachers, Christian Piety is "banish'd, while to advance their Market, they cry up their Wares, for "the granting of wonderfull, unheard of, peremptory Pardons, not onely "of sins already committed, but of sins that shall be committed by those "that are alive, and also the sins of the dead.--- So that by the sale of "these wares, together with being spoyl'd of our Money, Christian pie- "ty is extinguished; while any one may promise himself impunity, upon "paying the rate that is set upon the sin he hath a mind to commit: hence "Whoredoms, Incests, Adulteries, Perjuries, Murders, Thefts, &c. and "all manner of wickedness, have at once their Off-spring. What wic- "kedness will mortal men be afraid to commit, when they may promise "themselves licence, and impunity of sinning, while they live, and for a "little more Money Indulgences may be purchased for them after they "are dead? Especially the *Germans*, who are of a credulous temper, "and easie to be perswaded by pretences of piety, and a shew of Reli- "gion. A Fourth Grievance was this, That the Indulgences were sold "for Defence against the Barbarians, but the Money was laid out to "maintain the Luxury of Kindred, and to advance their Families.--- "The Fifth was this, That the Pope, and the rest of the Bishops and "Pillars of the *Roman* Church have always some Cases reserved, for "which you must make a new Bargain, and pay more Money, or no "Dispensation. The sixth was this, That if any one have wherewithall "to pay, he may not onely be indulged the present transgression of these "Constitutions (about reserved Cases) but they may be permitted to "transgress them for the future; whence those that are dispensed with, "take occasion to commit Perjuries, Murders, Adulteries, and such like "wickedness, which all springs from the cursed Covetousness of some "Ecclesiasticks. I might adde more out of their Seventh Grievance, "about the Stationary Preachers of Indulgences, of whom the Princes "complain, that they devour the very Blood and Marrow of the poor, "and themselves live in more than *Sybaritical* Luxury and Delights. But I'le transcribe no more of this; I would not indeed have transcrib'd so much, but that the Book whence I have it, is but in few hands: And that what I have said, may not be tedious, I'le refresh you with a story.

(l) A Noble-man told *Tecelius* (the chief Publican of Indulgences) that he had a mind to commit a very heinous sin, and he desired *present* Pardon of that *future* sin: *Tecelius* for a great summe of money gives him the Indulgence, the Noble man pays down the Money, and receives his Bull: Afterwards, the Noble-man took occasion in a certain Wood to rob *Tecelius*, and break open his Chests of Indulgences; and when *Tecelius* threatned him with all manner of Curses, the Noble-man

k *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum, fol.* 177, 178.

l *Chemnit.* [illegible] p. 745.

shewed him his Bull of Indulgences, that he payd so dear for, and laughing at him, told him, this was the Sin that he had a mind to commit, when he was so fully absolved. 'Twould drive out this Discourse into too great a length, to (but particularly) mention the several Conferences, Disputations, Writings, Diets, that pass'd for above twenty years, ere the Council was assembled at *Trent*, and to mention what was done there at several times for above twenty years more, e're they so much as attempted to debate the business of Indulgences, and when 'twas attempted, how they durst (*m*) not meddle with that Fistula, but shuffled up a Decree about them, the last day of their Session, (*n*) in which Decree they acknowledge, *Such abuses in them, that give the Heretick* (as they call us) *occasion to blaspheme them*; *and they acknowledge such wicked gains in the sale of them, that is very much a cause of abusing Christian People*; *and they acknowledge also other abuses, through Superstition, Ignorance, Irreverence, and otherwise, which they referre to be reformed by the Pope, who they say hath alone power to dispense them.* And to give us a demonstration what we may expect for the reforming of the Abuses of them, themselves break the Law the same day they made it; Cardinal (*o*) *Morone* as chief President, granted to every one that was present in the Session, or had assisted in the Council, a plenary Indulgence; when they had but then decreed, that the sole dispensing of them belongs to the Pope. But I'le say no more to the History of Indulgences.

m *History of the Council of Trent. l. 8 p. 801*

n *Concil. Bin. Edit. Tom. 9. p. 433.*

o *Hist. of the Council. p. 813.*

Thirdly, The next thing I am to shew you, is, the *Contradictions* of them; and herein I shall take *Bellarmine* for their Oracle, and give you a gleaning of Contradictions in five things he saith about Indulgences. *viz.* To an Authentical Indulgence, there must be, (*p*) 1. *Authority* in the Giving. 2. *Piety* in the Cause. 3. A State of *Grace* in the Receiver. 4. The *thing* pardoned is, not the Fault but the *Punishment*. 5. The *Punishment* pardoned, is neither Natural, nor those that are inflicted in any outward Court that is contentious, whether Ecclesiastical or Secular. Now do but observe some few (of many) gross Contradictions about all these, *e. g.*

p *Bellarm. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 11. & c. 7.*

1. As to the *Authority* of granting Indulgences: He saith, that Christ in giving the Keyes to *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles, gave to them the Power of *Order*, and to *Peter* the Power of *Jurisdiction*; so that the Pope holds from *Peter* a peculiar Power of Jurisdiction; every ordinary Priest may pardon Sin, deliver the Soul from Hell, but he cannot discharge them from *temporal* Satisfactions. How many Contradictions there are in this, I cannot say, but pray take notice of these.

First, The Keyes were given *equally* to *all* the Apostles, therefore not so to *Peter*; I question not but this hath been evidenced to you in a former Exercise.

Secondly, What a Contradiction is it to say, the Pope cannot pardon the Penance enjoyned by a Priest, and yet can pardon what is required by

by God? *i. e.* he cannot take off the ſentence of an Inferiour Court, but he can take off the ſentence of a Superiour: As if a man ſhould ſay among us, A Juſtice of the Peace cannot diſcharge a man from the Stocks, that is ſet there by a Conſtable, but he can give a man a Pardon for his Life, that is condemned by the Judge. Whereas this is obvious to all, that no inferiour Judge can take off the Sentence of a Superiour. What will not theſe men dare do, that dare cry up the Pope to be Superiour to God himſelf?

2. As to *Piety* in the Cauſe. The pretended Cauſes are ſuch as theſe: *viz.* The Building of Churches, the endowing of Hoſpitals, the making of Bridges, the Warring againſt Infidels or Hereticks, or ſome other Acts of Charity.

Firſt, This contradicts the Scripture-Conditions for Pardon of Sins; but what care they for Scripture?

Secondly, Where's Piety in the Cauſe, (*q*) when the Pope upon the day of his Coronation, ſitting upon a Throne ſet upon the top of the ſtairs of St. *Peters* Church, throws Indulgences among the people, as one would throw a handfull of Farthings among a Company of Beggars, to ſcramble for them, catch as catch can? But do they ſay, that *piety* is in the Cauſe? the real Cauſe is to get Money. I know *Bellarmine* is very angry with us, for charging this upon them; but let them anſwer their own Authors in this matter. *Matth. Pariſienſ.* tells us, that when ſeveral were drawn in, under *Innocent* the fourth, unto the Holy Warre, the Pope compell'd them to redeem their Vows: (*r*) *Leo* the tenth, gave out Indulgences for the repayring of St. *Peters* Church, whereas *Julius* his predeceſſor left an infinite Treaſure to that end, and the Money gathered by Indulgences was laid out about the Palace of the *Medici* in *Florence*, much of it diſtributed among the Cardinals and his Minions; and the Indulgences of *Saxony*, (*s*) he gave unto his Siſter *Magdalene*, wife unto *Franceſchetto Cibo* Baſtard Son of *Innocent* the 8th; by reaſon of which Marriage this *Leo* was created Cardinal at the Age of Fourteen years. But what need I mention particulars? See but the *Taxa Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ*, and there you have the ſeveral ſummes ſet upon the ſeveral ſins; I'le name ſome few, (*t*) *viz.* *For the carnal knowledge of his Mother, Siſter, or other Kinſwoman by Blood or Marriage*, or *his God mother, five Groſſu's* (*Groſſus* is neer about a Groat of our Money, but I'le reckon it high enough) *five Six-pences. For the deflowring of a Virgin* (6 *groſ.*) *ſix Sixpences. For Perjury*, (6 *gr.*) *ſix Six-pences. For a Woman that drinks any Potion, or doth any other act to deſtroy her live-child within her*, (5 *gr.*) *five Six-pences. For him that kills his Father, Mother, Brother, Siſter, Wife*, (*D. 1. carl. 5.*) *one Crown and five Groats.* And in the Table for diſpenſing about Marriages, when the Rates are ſtated for the firſt and ſecond degree, there is added, *Note diligently, that Favours, and Diſpenſations of this kind are not to be granted to the Poor*; and the Reaſon is given, *becauſe they*

are

q *Mulin. Novelty of Popery*, p. 465.

r *Review of the Council of Trent*, p. 91, 92

s *Hiſtor. of the Counc. of Trent.* p. 5.

t *Taxa Cancel. Apoſt. fol.* 35, 37, 38, 41.

are not (i.e. not capable of paying for them) *therefore they cannot be comforted.* *Voetius* (*u*) tells us, That the Papists he convers'd with, deny that ever there was any such thing, or any such Book, and say, we slander them: Whereas *Espencæus* † tells us, that it was openly sold, and he tells us so with this Remarque: *'Tis a wonder, that at this time, in this Schisme, that such an infamous Index of such filthy and to be abhorred wickedness is not suppress'd,* ('twas printed at *Paris*, in the year 1520.) *there's neither in* Germany, Switzerland, *nor in any other place where there's a Defection from the* Roman *See, a Book more to their Reproach; and yet* (saith he) *it is not suprest by the Favourers of the Church of* Rome, *it teacheth and encourageth to such wickedness, as we may be afraid to hear named, and a price is set to all Buyers.* Is not this enough to shew the *piety* of them?

u *Voet. Select. Disp. part.* 2. p. 296.

† *Espencæus in Titum. c.* 1. *digr.* 2. p. 479.

3. The third requisite is, The Receiver of Indulgence must be in the State of *Grace*. 'Tis ordinarily said, they must be *confess'd*, and *contrite*, though others deny the necessity of it; every way here's a swarm of Contradictions. I'le name one or two.

First, They deny, that any one can know, whether he be in a state of Grace or not: pray unriddle me this; The Decree about Indulgences saith, that Indulgences are very profitable to Christian people, and damns those that say otherwise: And the same (*x*) Council damns those that shall so far own their Christianity as to affirm their Faith to be certainly *saving*. But I'le quit this, and request you to consider the next.

x *Concil. General. & Provincial. Bin. Edit.* Tom. 9. p. 362: conc. Trid. Sess. 6. can. 15, 16, 23. &c.

Secondly, Whether is there any infallible Evidence of a Persons not being in a state of *Grace*? if there be, what is it? Will the living and dying in all manner of *mortal* sins, such as Blasphemy, Witchcraft, Murder, Incest, Adultery, Perjury, reckon up all the wickedness that you can in the World, will these speak a man to be Graceless? Indulgences provide for a full pardon of all these sins: The stationary Indulgences of the City of *Rome*, that is, the Indulgences annexed to every Church, granted to those that visit them, amount to a Million of Years, (to gratifie *Bellarmine* for telling me why they grant so many, I will not make any Observations upon *Gregories* Dedication of the Church of *Lateran*, (*y*) when he gave as many dayes of Indulgence, as there fall drops of Rain, when it rains without ceasing for the space of three Dayes and three Nights; and when *Gregory* feared, lest the Treasury of Grace would be emptyed by that profuseness, Christ appeared unto him, and told him, He was willing he should grant more Indulgences, for the people had need of them; but I will take *Bellarmine's* word, that he hath not read this in any Author he likes, and for the reason beforesaid I'le let it goe.) I might reckon up an innumerable company more in several places: But now why so many years? a man can do Penance in this World no longer than he lives, and their Purgatory they say lasts no longer than the Day of Judgement; what use is there then of so many

y *Chemnit. Exam.* p. 739.

millions

millions of years of Indulgence? *Bellarmine* (I thank him) tells me, (a) "We cannot deny, but that some are bound by the Penitential Ca- "nons to some thousands of years penance; for if to every deadly sin "there be due by the Canons so many years Penance, as to some three, "to some seven, *&c.* then he that hath accustomed himself to Perjury "and Blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commits "Murders, Thefts, Sacriledges, Adulteries, *without doubt the Popes had respect to such as these, when they gave Indulgences for ten or twenty thousand years.* So then, if they commit all the sins before mentioned so often, that the Penance due for them would amount to millions of years, yet they need fear nothing, they are provided of Indulgences, they shall go to Heaven as sure as the Pope has the Key of it. Well, let's lay these things a little together. He tells us, Those that receive benefit by Indulgences, must be in the state of Grace; and he also tells us, that without doubt the Pope had respect (great kindness certainly) for those that accustome themselves to Perjury and Blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commit Murders, Thefts, Sacriledges, Adulteries, *&c.* Now then, either Indulgences profit those that are not in a state of Grace, or these Belialists pass for Saints with their infallible Judge; either of which is an abominable contradiction.

z *Bell. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 9. p. 25.*

4. As to *what* is pardoned by Indulgences. He saith, the *Fault* is never pardoned, but the temporary *Punishment*. Here I have two Questions to ask, and one Story to tell, and all from themselves.

First, What mean those Clauses usual in Indulgences, of pardon of *Fault* and *Punishment?*

Secondly, What say they to *Venial* sins, they are Faults, and there they grant both Fault and Punishment, are pardoned. But to let these pass, I le give a story that smells rank, out of St. *Francis* his Conformities, (a *Folio* stuffed with as prodigious Lies as ever Paper was stained with,) among other Whiskers take this about Indulgences: (*a*) "While "blessed *Francis* stood in his Cell at St. *Mary's de Portiuncula*, and "most fervently prayed to God for Sinners, there appeared an Angel "of the Lord unto him, who bade him go to the Church, for there Christ, "and blessed *Mary*, with a great multitude of Angels expected him; "he presently went, who when he saw Christ with his Mother standing "at his right hand, and a great multitude of Angels, he fell upon his "face for Fear and Reverence, and then our Lord Jesus Christ said to "him, as he lay prostrate before him and his Mother, *Francis*, thou "and thy Companions are much solicitous for the salvation of Souls; Ask "what thou wilt about the Salvation of Nations, and the Comfort of "Souls, and the Honour and Reverence of God, because thou art given "for a Light to the Nations, and a Reparation of the Church: And he "lay a while as rapt up in the sight of God, but at length when he "came to himself, he begg'd Indulgence for all and every one that came "to that place, that entered into that Church, of all their sins universally

a *Liber conformitatum vit. B. & Seraph. Pat. Francisci ad vitam I.C.D. N. impr. Bonon. 1590. p. 198, 199.*

"and

"and generally of all their sins, of which they had made Confession to
"the Priest, and received his Command; and he besought his blessed
"Mother the *Advocate of Mankind*, to intercede for the Grant of this:
"The most blessed and most humble *Queen of Heaven* being moved
"with the Prayers of blessed *Francis*, presently began to supplicate her
"Son, telling him, it became him to have regard unto the Prayers of
"blessed *Francis* his Servant. His Divine Majesty, presently said, It is
"a very great thing thou hast asked, but Brother *Francis* thou art wor-
"thy of greater things, and thou shalt have greater things, but I will
"that thou go to my Vicar, to whom I have given power of binding
"and loosing in Heaven and in Earth, and from me, ask of him this In-
"dulgence. Whereupon he took his Companion Brother *Masseus*, and
"went to Pope *Honorius*, and told him, that he had repaired a Church
"to the Honour of the blessed Virgin, and he desired that he would
"grant Indulgence there, without Offerings, who answered, *that can-*
"*not conveniently be done, for he that receives Indulgence, must put to*
"*his helping hand*; but tell me, (saith he) how many years Indulgence
"wouldst thou have? He answered, I will, that whosoever comes to
"this Church, confess'd, and contrite, and absolved by the Priest as he
"ought, that he be absolved from Fault and Punishment from the day of
"his Baptism, unto the day and hour of his entring into the Church afore-
"said, and I ask it in the behalf of Christ who sent me to thee: The
"Pope said three times publickly, It pleaseth me that thou have it, and
"So blessed *Francis* bowed his head, and went out; which when the
"Pope saw, he called, O Simpleton, whither goest thou? what dost
"thou carry away of this Indulgence? *Francis* answered, your word is
"enough--- I'le have no other Instrument, let Blessed *Mary be the Paper*,
"Christ the Notary, and Angels the witnesses, *&c.*--- Miracles are re-
"lated by the Dozen to confirm this Indulgence, I'le mention but one:
"Upon the day of Indulgence, (the first of *August*) Brother *Cornelius*
"saw the Blessed Virgin with her Child in her Arms, and the sweet Babe,
"* did without intermission, with his own hands bless all the People
"that were out of Devotion present, and imparted to them his Grace.
Well, you see here, both Fault and Punishment pardoned by Indulgen-
ces, and yet Indulgences can onely pardon the Punishment: Reconcile
these.

* *Is he a child still?*

5. A fifth (and the last thing) I shall name, of what is fruitfull of Con-
tradictions is, the *kind* of Punishments that are pardoned by Indulgen-
ces; *Bellarmine* saith, they are neither Natural, nor those that are in-
flicted by any contentious Court, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical.

If this be so, then there's nothing forgiven, for (*b*) what sufferings
more are there to be pardoned, but those that are Natural or imposed?
If any more were due for sins, without doubt God would inflict them
upon the Damned; But God inflicts no other upon them, Therefore *&c.*
But *Bellarmine* tells us, they are those Punishments that are inflicted in

b *Thes. Salm. part. 2. p. 77 r. 11. &c.*

the

the Penitentiary Court, which we voluntarily fulfil, to which we are not any compelled, but by the Fear of God, and the stingings of our Conscience. Pray who gives the Priest power to inflict any punishment upon those whose sins are pardoned? But if we are bound in Conscience, and in the Fear of God to perform them, how dare the Pope release them? But pray let's again consider, what are the Punishments usually inflicted? They are Prayers, and Alms, and Fasting. Must not that be a famous Church think you, where Fasting and Prayer are Punishments, and as it were layd in the ballance with the pains of Purgatory, which pains are as grievous as the torments of Hell, bating the Duration? Let them never boast more of their Devotion nor Charity; they are with them Penalties, with us Priviledges; we are so far from giving any thing to be excused these Duties, that we would not be hired out of the performance of them: Should any of our Ministers but preach such Dispensations, we should account them the Devils Apostles, (e) *deceitfull workers.* What! teach men how to sell themselves to work wickedness, and then how to purchase Heaven with their wages of unrighteousness! O my Soul enter not into their secret. But in short, we understand neither the Grammar nor the Divinity of pardoning, (d) of Repentance, who think there's nothing but Sin or Punishment that needs a Pardon. And thus I have shewed you some of their *Contradictions.* The next thing I promised to speak to, was their *Cheats*, and I may well be briefer here, for what is all that hath been spoken of, but a grand Cheat?

e 2 Cor. 11.13.

d *Chamier.* Panst. Tom. 3. l. 24. c. 15. Sect. 15.

Fourthly, The *Cheats* of Indulgences will be Notorious, bring them but forth into the Light, and every one may discern them. I need produce but a pattern, for they are all of a piece.

How shall a man be sure he is not cheated of his Money, when he cannot know what he buyes? And how can a man know what he buyes, when they are not agreed among themselves what they sell? (e) *e.g.* They are not yet agreed, whether an Indulgence be a Judiciary absolution, or a payment of the Debt by way of Compensation of Punishment out of the Treasury, or both, (I may adde, or neither, e're I have done with this particular;) Could they get over this, here's another difficulty in the way, *viz.* What Bond is loosed by Indulgence, *i. e.* what sins, what Punishments are we any way freed from? though *Bellarmine* (as you have heard) say, Without doubt the Popes had respect to the worst of men, yet he himself elsewhere saith, (f) *That we are neither absolv'd nor solv'd from the Guilt of any fault whether Mortal or Venial, by Indulgences.* Among several Reasons given, (g) I'le name but one: As a dead member receives not Influence from the other Members of the Body that are living, so he that is in *mortal sin*, is as a dead Member, and receives not Indulgence from the Merits of living Members. I know *Bellarmine* saith, (h) *The Saints cannot merit for others, but they may satisfie for others, there being in the Actions of the Righteous a double Value, namely, of Merit and Satisfaction*; (though the Distinction is every way a Nullity, there being neither Merit nor Satisfaction, but let

e *Bell.* de Indulg. l. 1. c. 3. §. 19.

f Idem c. 7. p. 21.

g *Rayneri* Pantheolog. Tom. 1. p. 1146.

h Bell. de Ind. l. 1. c. 2.

that pass for the present;) Without controversie (saith he,) one man's Merit cannot be applyed to another: yet by his favour, *Hadrian*, though he speaks less than *Bellarmine* in other things, he speaks more in this; for he saith, (*i*) He that is in *mortal sin* himself, may merit for another, *&c.* He calls *paying* for the Indulgence, *meriting* of it; and I think well he may, for his Money is well worth it. I might adde, they are not yet agreed what is meant by (*k*) *a Years Pardon*, whether 360 dayes of Penance, or onely all the Fasting dayes in the Year. If the former, what's meant by that usual Clause in Indulgences for so many Years, and so many *Quarentines*, or Forty dayes of Penance, besides those that are contained in the general account of the Year? They are not yet agreed about the Value and Efficacy of Indulgences, whether they are worth what they pretend, or not: Some do not stick to say, their holy Father may do by his Children, as a mother by hers, that promiseth her Child an Apple if he will do such a thing, but when he hath done it, she doth not give it. Neither are they yet agreed, whether they may not be effectual, though the Condition of them be not performed. But why do I enquire into those things that will not bear a Scrutiny? I have said enough to evidence, that neither Seller nor Buyer understand the Ware of their Market; and these two things more may be enough to prove them a *Cheat*.

i *Hadrian* 6 Quæst. de Sacram. in 4. lib. sent. fol. 163.

k Idem fol. 162.

I. When *Bellarmine* (*l*) saith, They are all agreed, that an Indulgence is not valid, unless the Cause be Just; and he names several things must concurre to make it just; but concludes, it belongs not to the Popes Subjects to judge, whether the Cause be just or unjust; they ought simply to account it just: And instanceth, how the Pope may grant the *greatest* Indulgences, upon the *lightest* Cause: *e.g.* When a plenary Indulgence is granted to all those that stand before the Doors of St. *Peters* Church, while the Pope upon *Easter-day* solemnly blesseth the People. We count this Condition ridiculous: *Ono* (saith he elsewhere) *they thereby shew their obedience to the Pope.* Is that it? Mark this I pray you: By this Doctrine, a man may live in Disobedience and Rebellion against God all his dayes, and at last so far obey the Pope, as to go see a fine Shew, without parting with any one sin, and he shall be saved. Who but those that are *given* (*m*) *up to strong delusions to believe a lye*, can believe this?

l *Bellarm.* de Indulg. l. 1. c. 12. p. 28, 29.

m 2 Thes. 2. 11. 12.

II. Neither those that grant, nor those that receive, nor those that plead for Indulgences, dare themselves *trust* to them; witness the solemn Services performed for them after their death, yea for the Pope himself. Now those that plead for the validity of plenary Indulgences, when they are ask'd, What need then of Funeral Obsequies? they answer, Some sins may be forgotten, *&c.* What! and yet the deceased hath had their *full*, their *plenary*, and their *most full* Indulgences! What these mean, take from one of their infallible Oracles, *Hadrian* the sixth, in his Book that was printed at *Rome* in the very time of his Papacy, and so this is as it were out of the Chair: He (*n*) tells us, that a Full Indulgence

n *Hadrian* ibid. 162.

dulgence reſpects Penance injoyned for *mortal* ſins; a Plenary Indulgence reſpects *Penance* injoyned for *mortal* and *venial* ſins; and a Moſt Full Indulgence reſpects the *Penance* that might have been injoyned for *mortal* and *venial* ſins. *Tollet* almoſt a hundred years after, gives us a little more light into that gradation of Indulgences, and tells us, (o) That a Full Indulgence reſpects the Remiſſion of the *Puniſhment* injoyned; a Fuller Indulgence reſpects that *Puniſhment* that might have been injoyned according to the Canons; the Fulleſt reſpects that *Puniſhment* which may be required by the Divine Judgement. Now then, if Indulgences pardon all manner of ſins, *mortal* and *venial*, all manner of Repentance that God or Man can require, and all manner of *Puniſhment* that God or Man can inflict, and yet thoſe that receive theſe Indulgences, when they are dead, need the ſame means for *Pardon*, that thoſe do that never had any Indulgences; doth not this evidence, that the chief Patrons of Indulgences do in their own Conſciences believe them to be a Cheat? I ſhall next ſhew you how *they are injurious to Chriſt*.

o *Tollet. Inſtruct. Sacerd. tit. 8. cap. 24. p. 676.*

Fifthly, Indulgences are *injurious* to Chriſt, and which is to me conſiderable, they *are moſt injurious to Chriſt*, where they *ſeem moſt to honour him*; what they ſpeak of Chriſt with the greateſt reverence, is at the bottom full of falſhood, injuſtice, and blaſphemy. *e. g.* They ſay, *One drop* of the Blood of Chriſt was enough to redeem the World: Doth not this Aſſertion put an ineſtimable value upon the Blood of Chriſt? Examine it a little, and you will find, that *Judas*-like, they betray him with a Kiſs: For,

1. This takes (*p*) away the Neceſſity of Chriſts Death, which the Scripture doth ſo often inculcate. What need the Son of God undergo ſuch a painfull, ignominious, and curſed a Death, if *one drop* of his Blood was ſufficient? How can we believe that the Father, who delighteth not in the death of a ſinner, would delight in the cruel and curſed Death of his moſt innocent, onely begotten Son, if it were not neceſſary for our Redemption? Can we think that God, who will not puniſh his damned Enemies beyond what they deſerve, would exact a puniſhment of his Son ſo much more than there was need? Is the Death of Chriſt ſuperfluous? I dare not ſay of the Captain of our Salvation, as *David* ſaid of the Captain of the Hoſt of *Iſrael*, *Dyed Abner as a Fool died?* No, Death was the Debt, and ſuch a Debt muſt be the Payment, as may pay the Debt, and that by the Sinner, or (through Grace) by his Surety.

p *Theſ. Salm.* part. 2. p. 71. &c.

2. If *one drop* of the Blood of Chriſt be ſufficient, and all the reſt to be layd up in a Treaſury, and the Satisfactions of Saints likewiſe added; then there needs more to redeem us from Temporal *Puniſhments*, than from Eternal wrath, and Chriſt is not a compleat Saviour; than which nothing is more abſurd in it ſelf, nor more reproachfull to Chriſt: To prove this, 'tis eaſie to multiply Scriptures, but to produce their own Authors, at preſent I'le name but one, who expreſſely tells us (*q*) *That it is onely Chriſt, with the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt, that can with plenary Authority grant all manner of Indulgence from Fault and Puniſhment.*

q *Cenſor. Tom. 1. Quæſt. de Indulgent. l. 191. concluſ. 5. 8.*

nisumem.---and it is Christ alone that can grant so many thousand thousand years of Pardon, as we find in some Popes Grants; for no Temporal Punishment can endure the thousandth part of that time.

Sixthly, Indulgences are abominably *injurious* to *Souls*: They came in upon the declining of piety, and they (*r*) are the product of the later and worser times. The plain truth is, Indulgences do in the Nature of the thing promote wickedness, for 'tis onely wicked men that need Indulgences; those that they account Saints, do so much more than they need, that their superfluous good Works constitute a Treasury for others: Sure then we may reckon, that their midling sort, though they have no Satisfactions to spare, yet they have so many, they need not be beholding to others; so that 'tis onely the worst of men that need Indulgence, and what can (*s*) "More oblige them to redouble their Crimes, "and misdemeanours, to abandon themselves to all manner of vice and "lewdness, than to be sure, that all the sins they can commit shall be for-"given them? yea, to have them pardoned before-hand, in having In-"dulgences for sins already committed, and to be committed, with this "expres Clause [*be they never so heynous*,]? *Marcus Antonius de Dominis* may (*t*) well say, That *Indulgences are one of the great Secrets of the Papacy, they are famous Gold-mines, out of which a great power of Gold hath been digged for the Apostolical See,---but they have utterly banished true Repentance from the Popish Churches.* *Novarrus* goeth further, (if I may credit *P. D. Moulin's* (*u*) quotation of him, I having not the Book by me) for although he was the Popes Penitentiary, yet when he writ for Indulgences, he could not abstain from saying, *The Grant of them is odious, because the Collectors seek not the good of Souls, but the Profit of Money*, &c. In short, what wicked man is there that gives any credit to their Doctrine of Indulgences, but will gratifie his Lusts, that he may have the pleasures of both Worlds? For according to that Doctrine, *There's none but Fools and Friendless can miss of Heaven.* But enough, enough, and more than enough, of this mischievous Doctrine.

Let's therefore in the last place, trye whether it is possible to make any good Use of so bad a Doctrine.

Use 1. Let them henceforth be *ashamed* of their absurd Reproaches of the *Reformed Churches*, as if they were not *pure* enough, or *strict* enough for them: What Doctrines have we, that the Devil himself can charge us with, like theirs of *Indulgences?* Those dayes are past with them, wherein twas *harder for a rich man to enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, than for a Camel to go through the eye of a Needle*; for now those need never doubt of Salvation: 'tis for such dull Souls as we are, to harp upon such harsh strings as these; (*x*) *They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him; for the redemption of their Soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever*, &c. And that other word of Christ, *What is a man profited, if he shall*

(*r*) Forbs Instruct. Histor. theol. lib. 12. c. 8. p. 655.

(*s*) Review. lib. 5. c. 1. p. 350.

(*t*) de Rep. Eccles. l. 5. c. 8. n. 13. p. 240.

(*u*) Novelty of Popery. lib. 3. c. 2. p. 467.

* Mat. 19. 24.

(*x*) Ps. 49. 6, 7, 8. & Mat. 16. 26.

shall gain the whole World, and lose his own Soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his Soul? We dare not answer these Scriptures with that Interpretation of *Prov.* 13. 8. which he doth that glosseth upon *Gerson*, in the forecited place, *The ransom of a mans life are his riches*; as if a man need do no more but purchase an Indulgence, and all is well. We like the Apostles counsel better, (y) *Let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoycing in himself, and not in another*; and that for the very reason which the Apostle gives, *For every man shall bear his own burden.* We are neither to be *proud* of being better than others, nor *trust* to share Benefits with those that are better than us. (z) The Wise Virgins had no Oyl to spare, when the Foolish had their Oyl to seek. We bless God, that we have a Christ to trust to, and not any that may, like (a) *Hermannus*, be many years worshipped for a Saint, and then his bones dug up, and burnt for an Heretick, by that very *Boniface* who appointed the first Jubile, and that with a singular respect to the visiting the Sepulchers of the Saints: Commend which you will, whether his worshipping or his burning of the Bones of any they call Saints, we think he might well have acknowledged with (b) *Eugenius*, *That what key he had of opening and shutting, through his folly he did not prudently make use of it.* Our common people can read in their Bibles, that they are (c) *Fools* which *make a mock of sin*, playing with it both in the Commission and Expiation: but we dare not do so: we dare not play the Mountebanks in Religion, to make some whiffling about the Conscience, and then stupifie it with a Cheat: We ingenuously confess, we have not better esteem of Indulgences, than had the Citizens of *Prague*, (d) who put the Indulgent-Merchant into the same Cart with some common Whores, about whose breasts they hung the Papal Indulgences, and so drew him and the Whores with the Indulgences hanging about their necks, exposing them to scorn through every street of the City; and then took the Bulls of Indulgences, and publickly and solemnly burnt them. Such honour may they meet with wherever they come.

y Gal. 6. 4, 5.

z Mat. 25. 8, 9.

a *Platina in vit. Bonifac. 8. p. 247.*

b *B. Bp. Tom. 15. p. 614. Eugen. 4 in his Pontif. Hildegard. 17.*

c Prov. 14. 9.

d *Chemnit. exam. p. 741.*

Use 2. I'le no longer forbear acquainting you with that by way of Use, which you might well expect in the opening of the Doctrine, *viz.* To state, how far God may be said to punish sin after he hath pardoned it. We deny not but those whose sins are pardoned, meet with many bitter Calamities in this world, but the question between the Papists and us is, Whether they are punishments of sin (e) properly so called; we grant they are *materially* Punishments, but not *formally*; *i. e.* the same things when suffered by wicked men are *punishments*, but to them they are onely *fatherly chastisements*, not *judicial punishments*; *wholsom Medicines*, not *Penal Executions*. *e. g.* A Malefactor hath his hand cut off for striking in a Court of Judicature, that's *properly* a punishment; an innocent Person hath his hand cut off, because 'tis gangren'd, that's not a *punishment* but a *kindness*. Plainly, a *punishment* is properly to satisfie Revenging Justice, a Judge (as such) hath no respect to the Offenders repentance, but God alwayes (f) chasti-seth *for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness.* We deny not but

e *Dallæus de pœn. & satisfac. lib. 1. c. 2. p. 4. 5. & seqq.*

f Heb. 12. 10.

g *Rivet.* Cath. Orth. Tom. 2. Tract. 3. qu. 13. p. 63.

but God chastiseth for sin, but the question between the [g] Papists and us, is not about the *impulsive* Cause, but the *final*, i. e. Whether God in punishing his Children do it to satisfie his Justice with another satisfaction besides that he hath received by the death of his Son. The shortest and the plainest Answer to this Question, will be to clear up those Scriptures which they

b 2 Sam. 12. 14

press into their service. They urge *David*'s case, (*h*) *Because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child---shall surely dye.* We grant, that because of *Davids* sin, his Child dyed, but we deny 'twas *properly* a *Punishment*. *Nathan* makes a plain difference between the punishment due to *David* for the sin which is pardoned, [i] (*the Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die,*) and the Discipline, whereby he would take off the scandal of wicked men; God as it were put off the person of a Judge, and assumed the person of a Father. Whereas they say, *David* prayed against it, and therefore 'twas a *Punishment*; the answer is easie: The sick man begs of his Physitian, that he may have no more nauseous physick, no more corroding Plaisters, &c. are his Medicines therefore *punishments?* God would cure *David*, and prevent others from taking encouragement to sin by his Example; to this end God makes use of dreadfull Physick, yet 'tis but physick. The like may be said

i ver. 13.

k Numb. 12. 14

to *Miriams* case, who was struck with Leprosie, [k] God would have her to be ashamed, and repent of her molesting his Servants in the discharge of their duty. But there are other instances of *pardoned persons*, struck with Death for their Offences, of whom they jeeringly ask us, *Did God strike them dead that they might mend their Lives?* e. g. *Moses* and *Aaron*, to

l Numb. 20. 24.

whom God said, [l] *Ye shal not enter into the land which I have given unto the children of Israel, because ye have rebelled against my Word*, &c. I answer, their death was not *properly* a *Punishment*, but matter of Instruction to other Believers; There's a singular Mystery in *Moses* his death, to teach, that the Law brings not into the Heavenly *Canaan*, that must be done by Christ: That of the O'd Prophet, to whom the very person that deceived

m 1 King. 13. 21, 22, 24.

him said from God, [m] *Forasmuch as thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the Lord---- thy Carkase shall not come unto the Sepulchre of thy Fathers; and when he was gone, a Lion met him by the way, and slew him?* God by the Threatning brought him to Repentance, and by his Death warns us to take heed how we swerve, though never so little, from his Command: There was his own Amendment to Salvation, and the Profit of the Church by so memorable a Monument of Gods severity. But what need I spend time in particular Instances, while the Scripture speaks of Believers in general, that Death is to them a Priviledge, not a Punishment? And Death

* 1 Cor. 3. 22.

† Phil. 1. 21.

‡ 1 Cor. 15. 55.

it self is * inventoryed among their Treasures, that whenever or however it seizeth upon them, 'twill be their Gain, † and matter of Triumph. ‡ In a word therefore, this dear Christians would I charge upon you, Above all things secure your Reconciliation with God, and then practically learn to answer Gods Ends in all your Chastisements and Tryals; set your selves to hate Sin, to be exemplary in Holiness, to live in the continual exercise and growth of Grace, till God translate you to glory.

3. Thirdly,

3. Thirdly, let's bless God for being delivered from the deviliſh Deluſions of that Religion. *Religion* did I call it? how do they forfeit the very Name, while they induſtriouſly ſtrive to make men *Atheiſts*, that they may make them *Papiſts*? and what bait can be more alluring, than that they can afford them Indulgence at ſo cheap a rate? Their Seraphical Doctor tells us of ſome [n] Indulgences granted to help to build ſome Church, or the like, thoſe that gave a peny towards it, ſhould be pardoned the third part of their Repentance, and for another peny another third part, and for another peny the laſt third part; ſo that for 3 *d.* for three half pence, ſaith † *Altiſſiodorenſis*; and among other proofs for the value of Indulgences he brings this, That the Head of *John* the Baptiſt was given to the Damoſel, by which Damoſel is meant the Church of the *Gentiles*; ſo that the Church of the *Gentiles* hath the Head of *John*, i. e. the Head of Grace, therefore ſhe may grant Indulgence to her Subjects: A profound demonſtration. So that he may be diſcharged from the troubleſom work of Repentance; this the Seraphical Doctor thinks to be falſe and ridiculous, and therefore he thus reſolves the value of Indulgences: In reſpect of him that grants them, they are of as much value as he ſayes they are; but in reſpect of him that receives them, they are of more or leſs value, according as he is diſpoſed: So then, if they are fit for none, they are worth nothing. *Angles* † reckons up ſix other Opinions, but all ſuch as will rather torment than ſatisfie an awakened Conſcience. Oh! what a miſerable plunge muſt that Soul be in, that truſting to Indulgences, commits Sin with greedineſs, and never conſidering till he comes to die, he findes too late, that the largeſt Indulgences are onely valuable according to the diſpoſition of the Receiver, and ſo he that moſt needs them, ſhall have leaſt benefit by them. Some of the very Popes themſelves have been aſhamed of theſe Cheats, and would have recalled them, but his Kindred oppoſed it, with the ſame Argument that *Demetrius* did *Paul*, [p] *By this Craft we have our wealth.* In ſhort, though they tell us, that Pope *Gregory* delivered *Trajan* out of Hell, yet we dare truſt to none but Chriſt, to *deliver us from the wrath to come*, and we bleſs God that we have no other to truſt to. We had rather now cry to God for Mercy, than too late cry out in our Miſery, [q] *Good God upon what a frail Spiders Web doth hang the vaſt weight of Papal Omnipotency!* Now we feel with a vengeance the Pope is not infallible. But I le cloſe all with what may be more profitable, than ſuch fruitleſs complaints.

n *Bonavent. in* Sent. Venet. Edit. Tom. 4. p. 323.

† *Altiſſiod in* Sent. l. 4. tract. 6. c. 9. fol. 40.

† *Angles in* quartum l. b. ſent. parr. 2 quæſt. de Indulg. p. 1415.

o *Platina de vit.* Bonifac. 9. p. 275.

p Act. 19. 25.

q *Mar. Ant. de* Dom. ibid. p. 245. n. 28.

gly. In the laſt place therefore, I would ſeriouſly caution you againſt that Mock-Religion, which is little elſe than an Engine of carnal Intereſt. As you love your Souls, take heed of all ſinfull tendencies, of either Head, Heart or Life, towards thoſe pernicious Doctrines, of which this is one of the chief. I freely confeſs, I ſee no cauſe of fear, (the Lord keep us from all confidence in any ſtrength of our own,) that ever that Religion ſhall reign in the Conſciences of thoſe that have been once delivered from it: but 'tis an eaſie matter to perſwade thoſe that are of no Religion, to be of that Religion. How many are there that walk in darkneſs in this Noon-day light? and 'tis an eaſie proceſs from Ignorance to Errour, and to be devout too in that Religion where Ignorance is the Mother of it. How many are there, that will rather part with Heaven than with their Luſts? an eaſie temptation muſt needs proſelyte them to that Religion that promiſeth

miſeth infallibly to ſecure both. In ſhort, Indulgences are the ſofteſt Arguments for delicate ſinners, and the Inquiſition the moſt cogent Argument for the refractory: To prevent therefore the Charms of the one, and to eſtabliſh againſt the knocking Argument of the other, I ſhall only commend theſe two things to you.

† Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 21. c. 27. p. 664.

First, Do not make light of Sin, and you can never be a Friend to Indulgences; † *Auguſtine* ſpeaks like himſelf, when he ſaith, *'Tis moſt difficult to find out, and moſt dangerous to define what ſins they are for which we may have Indulgence by the Merits of the Saints our Friends*; he profeſſeth, *He could not by his ſearch come to the knowledge of them*; and the Leſſon he would learn and teach from it, was this, *To avoyd all ſin, and not at all to truſt to the Merits of others.* We may cry out concerning this Doctrine, *Without controverſie great is the Myſtery of Ungodlineſs!* I grant there is a great controverſie betwen them and us about it, but yet when I conſider, that I do not find two of them of a mind, but that they every one charge one another with ſomething faulty in their particular Sentiments about them; and their darling Council, before they made the Decree about them, [r] cenſured all the Money-gatherers upon them, to be Incorrigible, and that they had no hopes of their amendment; I need not fear to ſay, *Without controverſie great is the Myſtery of Ungodlineſs.* For one who is himſelf guilty of *mortal* ſin, [s] at his pleaſure to grant to as many as he pleaſe, guiltey [t] of the moſt prodigious villanies, as large Indulgences as they can deſire, if this be not to encourage and propagate wickedneſs, what is? I would therefore commend this to you, Look upon Sin to be not onely the greateſt, but *The onely Evil*, and that not ſo much as [x] the leaſt can be pardoned without the Blood of Chriſt; and that as ever you expect benefit by † Chriſt, you muſt *depart from Iniquity*, and that whoſoever ſaith, [x] we may venture to *do evil that good may come, his damnation is juſt.* Whoſoever therefore makes the Remedies ſo light, ſo eaſie, ſo obvious, doth not onely leſſen but takes away the terror of the Diſeaſe, and brings it into contempt. I would therefore with all poſſible importunity begg of you, to ſet your ſelves againſt every ſin; watch againſt the temptations, occaſions, and firſt riſings of ſin. Be as ſhy of ſins of Omiſſion, and Male-adminiſtration, as of open wickedneſs; and then Indulgences will be no temptations to you to alter your Religion; then the *Jubile* (next year) which Pſeudo-Catholicks eſteem as [z] *the pleaſant Phantaſies of Popery, the Refuge of Sinners, the Grief of Purgatory, the Terror of Devils, the Mart of* Rome, *and the Triumph of the Pope*, will be no more to them than a *Bartholomew-Fair.* Do you ſtudy the Doctrine and Practice of Faith and Repentance, and you'l abhorre all fellowſhip with this *Doctrine of Devils.*

r Conc. Trid. Seſſ 21. c. 9. p. 401.

s Aquin. Suppl. 3 part. q. 26. art. 4. p. 33.

t Bellarm. lib. Sup.

u Heb. 9. 22.

† 2 Tim. 2. 19.

x Rom. 3. 8.

z Chamier. Panſt. Tom. 3. l. 24. c. 1. n. 5. p. 517. & c. 5. n. 11. p. 524.

Secondly, Make uſe of your *Bibles*, and while you do ſo, you'l neither be wheadled nor frighted out of your Religion. Let but Scripture-truth be your (a) *ſhield and buckler*, and you need not fear this *Romiſh* Peſtilence *that walks in darkneſs*, and you may alſo hope, that God will preſerve you from their barbarous deſtruction *that waſteth at Noon-day.* The Sword (b) of the Spirit is the onely offenſive Arms in the Chriſtian Armoury, and there's no weapon wounds them like this, and therefore (c) they wrap it in a cloth, and throw it behind the Ephod; but, my brethren, take it out, there's none like it; *hold faſt the form of ſound words*, which the Scripture teacheth, *in faith and love, which is in Chriſt Jeſus*, and you can never be ſeduced; for there (d) can be no Hereſies but by the miſunderſtanding of Scripture, (e) which we are not to hear onely with our Ears, but with our Minds. I take it to be a good way to prevent the perverting of Scripture, whenever a Text is alleadged for the proof of a Doctrine in queſtion, firſt lay by that Doctrine, and ſearch what is the genuine meaning of the Holy Ghoſt in that place, and then conſider what the mind of the Holy Ghoſt is in that queſtion. But I'le not be tedious, *Bellarmine* is the perſon I have moſt oppoſed, I'le make a fair offer, *viz.* to be determin'd by his deciſion of the Queſtion, if they will ſtand to what he hath left upon Record, which is as applicable to this buſineſs as to that about which he wrote it, *viz.* (f) *Concerning thoſe things which depend upon the Divine Will, we are not to aſſert any thing but what God himſelf hath revealed in the Holy Scriptures.* Do but ſtand to this, and *Farewell Indulgences.*

a Pſal. 91. 4, 6.

b Epheſ. 6. 17.

c 1 Sam. 21. 9.

d Tertul. de reſur. carn. c. 11. p. 417.

e & adverſ. Gnoſtic. c. 7. p. 595.

f Bellarm. de amiſſ. grat. & ſtat. pec. lib. 6. c. 3. p. 895.

SERMON XX.

SERMON XX.

There are But two Sacraments under the New Testament.

Prov. 30. 6.

Adde thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee: and thou be found a lyar.

THE independency of Proverbs informs us, that we may spare the labour of reflections upon the Context; seeing every Proverb is big with its own sence, and fully comprehends its own design and reach.

The words now read unto you as the Ground and Measure of this Morning Exercise, are weighty as to their *Charge* and *Arguments*.

1. The *Charge* is here imperative, born of Authority, and brought into the sight, to bound the daring Usurpations of aspiring fools. The throne of God ought not to be invaded by the Sons of men; nor must a Peerage in his Empire be usurped or claimed by distant mortals, whose policy and safety 'tis to be *Auditors* and Scholars, and not Dictators in the matters of Gods Kingdom. The best man is only συνάθρος τῆ ἀληθείᾳ ὢν, and φύσει δοῦλος, as *Aristotle* speaks, and therefore (as he said, βέλτιστοι γινόμεθα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν βαδίζοντες. *Plutarch* περὶ δεισιδαιμ. So πρὸς τὸν θεὸν βαδίζων βέλτιστος in respect to God, whose absolute Property, and unlimited Prerogative by any thing but the blessed harmony of his own infinite Perfections, together with his own Omnipotence, Omniscience, Holiness, and Allsufficiency, being both matchless and incommunicable, do speak him so fitly and undoubtedly our Owner, Governour and Father, as that observance and obsequiousness must unavoidably more become us than bold pretences to his Throne and Scepter. Gods words are like himself, such glorious Emanations of his own Majesty and Excellence, as will neither suit nor bear the mean additions of aspiring Man.

All men are Subjects, and must act by their derived Authority and Commission. Gods words are like the Sun moving in a distinct and proper Sphere, and scorning the accessions of our more dim and languid Lamps. All that put in their claims for Legislation in Church or State, are under Law for what they impose and speak, and are to be presented to the Barre of God, in answer to this universal summon, *viz.* Give an account of thy Stewardship, for thou wast but a Steward, and must be no longer so. *Adde thou not* therefore *to his words, lest he reprove thee.*

Quere 1. *What are those additions that are not forbidden to us here? Is every thing a sinfull Addition that is not found expressely in the Words of God?*

1. Words that explain the sence, and force, and usefulness of God's words, are not forbidden here, *Neh.* 8. 8. Letters, syllables and words, are not the mind of God, farther than their signification reaches. Words are the vehicles of sence; the Indices of the heart. Till they are known and opened, we are but Barbarians unto others, 1 *Cor.* 14. 11. There is no Commandment transgress'd by a true Explication of those words, whereby God signifies his mind. And to acquaint men with the proofs and characters, whereby it may be manifest, that this is God's mind, is none of those additions which God forbids to make unto his words.

2. Expres determinations of times and places in particular, for the discharge of such incumbent duties, as must be done in general, and cannot be discharged in particular, without the fixing of time and place. How can Assemblies meet together, or publick Worship be discharged, till a particular time and place be both stated and known?

3. Pertinent and distinct *Applications* of general Rules unto particular Cases, and consequently such expres Reasons and Arguments, as shall prove them pertinent and improveable, as to the case in hand. Fastings and Feastings, Prayers and Praises, Almes, Forbearance, Silence and Speaking, are in the general attended with Lawes imposed upon all; but *quoad hic & nunc*, the calls and circumstances of emergent Providences must state and fix the Case, and shew the Duty in its Season.

4. The Modes of *Worship* may vary in their frame and use, and may be under circumstances order'd so to doe; and yet the Precept of my Text observed. I may be bound to preach, or praise, or pray; but yet the subject, length or method, and the peculiar words and phrases may be variously determined by present choyce and order.

5. The use of *natural or accessory Helps*, no wayes destructive, but subservient to our stated work, may be determined to be used, and yet this Law remain inviolated. I may use or forbear my Notes, use all those helps that are at hand, and find out words acceptable.

6. Whatever may commodiously *preserve*, *promote* and *quicken* due Purity, Truth and Order, and is no wayes inconsistent with Gods Laws, and

and the true intereſt, ends, credit and harmony of Chriſtian Godlineſs, in all its Exerciſes, comes not within the cenſure of my Text.

What is it that we muſt not adde unto theſe words of God? I anſwer, theſe things. Quere 2.

1. Nothing as God's which is not His: As Articles of Faith, new points of Doctrine, Promiſes, Threatnings, Prophecies, Revelations, Traditions or Miracles, pretended to be of God, that are not ſo, either as to God's Errand or Operation.

2. Nothing to vye with God's revealed Truths or Lawes, as to Authority or importance. For this is to uſurp the Throne of God, and claim a Peerage with abſolute Supremacy.

3. Nothing that ſavours of ſuch additional Supplements, as ſeem to argue God of Ignorance, Imprudence or Negligence. For this is to turn Accuſers or Upbraiders of the Holy One, as guilty of defects, miſcarriages and miſtakes.

4. Nothing that does deſtroy the End, or contradicts the Errand, or tends to weaken the awfull and ſucceſsefull Influences of the Words of God. For this referres to nothing but diſappointment and diſturbance of the noble Ends and proper Courſe of Lawes and Government.

5. Nothing that builds what God deſtroyes, or ruines what God deſigns expreſſely and reſolves to build. The wiſe and righteous Governour of the World is moſt impatient of ſuch contradictions. When God takes down a Ceremonial frame of Worſhip, to clear his way to better diſpenſations; then to cloud his Heavens with Pompous Inſtitutions, is to diſturb and vex the Eyes of ſpiritual Worſhippers, even with the duſt and rubbiſh of what was taken down and thrown aſide. Thus alſo the Commands of God muſt not be render'd void, through Mens Traditions, *Mat.* 15. 2---9.

6. Nothing that makes a wrong Conſtruction of God's words. Falſe Gloſſes, and corrupt Interpretations of the Truths of God, are vain and bold Additions. Can we imagine that thoſe words can ſignifie God's mind, which have no ſence in them nor ſtated import, before the Pope and Councels have ſet their ſtamp and ſeal upon them? Are they bound to conſtrue right, or are they at perfect liberty to make the ſame Expreſſion true and falſe at pleaſure?

7. In one word: Nothing that ſuperſedes, or is co-ordinate with, or derogatory to God's words, in Doctrine, Government and Worſhip; or prejudicial, burthenſome, or unprofitable unto the purity, peace, and order, Edification or needfull Harmony and conſolation of Souls and Churches, ſtrong or weak.

What are thoſe Reaſons that are produced in my Text as Diſſwaſive from theſe Additions? Quere 3.

1. The Caſe muſt be debated; the word us'd in the Text comes

from יכח that signifies to dispute the Case, and debate the matter by Argument. God pondereth all the wayes of man. All claims shall be enquired into. Bold Usurpations and Aspirings must be reflected on with a *Quo jure hoc feciſtis*. God will never prodigally diffuse his own Prerogative. Others must act by deputation and deriv'd Authority; and both their Commissions and Discharge must be produced and canvased in open Court. He that will bring every thing into open Court, will not forbear enquiries after those that so audaciously usurp his Crown and Scepter, and storm his Throne. Therefore we must carry as within the Prospect of that great Tribunal, where our precarious Allegations must abide the test.

2. The Guilty will then be exposed in open Court. God will be Conquerour in Judgement, and it will appear a Crime unanswerable, to have the Broad Seal counterfeited. Wo to all the bold pretenders to the infallible Chair, whose Claims are larger than their Right and Warrant. If *Aaron* and *Miriam* found it so costly to challenge *Moses* or a Peerage with him, what will become of those who will not suffer God to abide Greatest and undisturbed in the Throne; when Majesty appears to vindicate Supream Authority from all those bold invasions which the usurping Tyrant of Gods Church hath made? It's vigorous lustre will make his bold pretences like a thin Exhalation, to melt away and vanish. Supremacy is a tender thing, and to build Stubble, Wood and Hay upon the best Foundation, will be found no mans Gain. What's the Chaffe to the Wheat? The Word of God is tryed, and may be trusted to; but he that leans upon the Reeds of *Egypt*, will make his confident Recumbencies at least assuredly preparatory unto his most shamefull Fall. He that's found a Lyar at the Barre of God, cannot escape the smartest censures and most severe reflections that ever yet astonished and amazed Delinquents. God will not patronize the lyes and forgeries of any swelling or aspiring bubbles. Creatures must know their distance and the Truth. 'Tis here our Reputation is the most tendered thing; and he that is found a Lyar here, as speaking from God, that which is not of him, and that as for God, which really is against him, must then expect a very round discharge from God. Hence then let us take occasion to enquire,

Quere 4. *Whether Baptisme and the Lords Supper be the only Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace under the New Testament?*

1. We shall pass over now the Consideration of those words in Greek and Hebrew which *Bellarmine* layes so great a weight upon, as מלואים, חקים and רוא, and אות, *a sign*, *Gen.* 17. 11. rendered by σημεῖον, σφραγὶς, *Rom.* 4. 11. ἀντίτυπον, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. ὑποδεῖγμα. *Heb.* 8. 5. 9. 23. μυστήριον, *Latine mysterium quod aliud exiſtit, aliud ſignificat*, from whence it is also called σύμβολον. All which words being of larger or more restrained signification, may be applyed to more or fewer things at pleasure.

2. Nor

2. Nor need we dwell upon the Covenant of Grace, ſeeing it is agreed on all hands to be a Contract betwixt God and Man, through the Mediation of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Return and Reconcilement of ſinners to God; and ſo their Juſtification, Adoption, Sanctification and Glorification. And by our ſpeaking of the Sacraments of this Covenant, we preſcind the thoughts of Sacraments in Innocence. And as in our Goſpel-times, this Covenant is publiſhed in its laſt and beſt Edition and Impreſſion, and hath been ſealed and ratified with the blood of ſprinkling, and as the Teſtament of our dying Friend, exhibited to the World by the Lord himſelf, and thoſe commiſſionated by him, *Hebr.* 2. 3, 4. And held forth plainly, powerfully and ſucceſſefully, without the vail and burthens of its former Diſpenſations under the Legal Oeconomy: So are we to conſider here what Saraments and Seals are annexed to and fixt upon it, waving all former Sacraments as to their Frame or Number.

3. Therefore the Term *Sacraments* well opened and applyed, muſt clear and end the Controverſie in this Article. And here we muſt premiſe, that the term is unſcriptural, not written in it, but derived elſewhere. And ſo we muſt enquire after ſuch things as theſe. 1. How many things in Authors are ſignified by the Term. 2. How far it may be applicable to more than theſe aſſigned in the Queſtion, and ſo how far the Controverſie lies more in words than things. 3. Wherein it is only applicable to theſe two. 4. What are the Arguments and Reaſons of the Papiſts, whereby they prove the number of them to be ſeven; and ſo give them their Anſwer. 5. Why the Proteſtants aſſert but two. Which when they are well diſpatched, may better ſhew the truth and meaſures of the Caſe in hand before us.

Firſt; As to the various *uſe* and acceptation of the word; I find the word *Sacrament* uſed in theſe ſeveral ſences.

1. It's taken for that Pledge, Pawn or *pignus* which they that fought did leave in the hands of their cheif Prieſt during their fight, when the fight was ended, the Conquerour took his own, and the other, *in pœnam injuſtæ litigationis*, loſt his, and it was devoted to the Treaſury. *Varro. Lib.* 4. *de Ling. Lat.* And this Pledge was called a Sacrament.

2. It's taken for that Oath *quo quis ſacris interpoſitis obligatur.* And this Oath or Obligation was *Sacramentum*, in that it was *obligatio Numinis & Religionis interventu confirmata*; and hence, *Sacramentum militare*, for ſuch as were liſted by Oath, and bound to continue till the War was done. So *Veget. lib.* 2. *de re militari.* Thus alſo *Jerom* calls the Oath of *Hippocrates* upon his Diſciples *Sacramentum*, *Tom.* 1. *Epiſt. ad Nepot. de vit. Cleric. & Sacerdot.* and *Juvenal* in his *Sat.* 15. calls the very *milites*, *Sacramento rogatos*, Sacraments themſelves.

Præmia nunc alia atq; emolumenta notemus.
Sacramentorum.

3. Hence

3. Hence probably it is, that our *Votum Baptismale* was called *Sacramentum*: (a) As *Recordare tyrocinii tui diem, quo Christo in Baptismate consepultus in Sacramenti verba jurâsti.*

(a) *Jerom. Tom. 1. Epist. 1. ad Heliodor. de laude vit. solitar.*

4. Sometimes it is taken for no more than a meer *arcanum* or Secret. Thus the Sacrament of Incarnation, and often in this sence have you *Sacramentum* in the *Vulg. Latin. Dan.* 2. 18, 30. 4. 6. *Eph.* 1. 9. 3. 5. *Col.* 1. 27. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. Thus any thing of occult and sacred signification, as Parables, Types, in things or Persons, *&c.* they may be called Sacraments, as *Jerom ubi supra.* And then our Number may exceed a Septenary.

5. Sometimes it is taken for the Sign, the thing signified, and the Action, inward and outward, and the word it self, whereby God commands the *Signum propter rem signatam.*

6. Sometimes it is taken for any *sacra rei signum.* And thus there may be as many Sacraments, as there can be Signs of holy matters by words or things.

7. Most to our purpose it imports our Dedication of our selves to God, by Vow, expres'd by solemn Ceremony, signifying a mutual Covenant betwixt God and us, and his reception of us.

Secondly, As to it's Application to the Case in hand. Let us enquire, How far it may be accommodated to more than two; and then, How far only to these two, *Baptisme*, and *the Lords Supper.* Which take as followes.

1. If it be true what *Bellarmine* asserts, that it suffices as to the Nature of a Sacrament, that it is a sensible Sign, let the sense be what it will; then I confess, there are more Sacraments than two; for every Word and Thing may be a Sacrament, that may be seen, or felt, or heard, or tasted. Then can neither of these two be a single Sacrament, but each hath many Sacraments in one. Then Penance, Matrimony, Orders, Confirmation, *&c.* are truely Sacraments. Then Books and Sermons will be Sacraments. Yea, our very Words and Actions in all our joynt Approaches unto God, will mutually be Sacraments from each to other: But did not all the Sacraments of the Old Testament consist of visible Signs? Is there no difference betwixt the Preached Word and Sacraments as such? Did Christ administer the Sacrament to all he preach'd or spake unto? How is it that St. *Austin* makes the Word and Elements to constitute a Sacrament? And do not Sacraments require a Consecration? If not, what makes the Elements a Sacrament? If they doe, then what must consecrate the words of Consecration? and so *in infinitum.* And lastly, Did the Councel of *Florence* determine aright or not, when in their Definition of a Sacrament they did distinguish the Matter and Form each from other? If they did, Then a sensible Sign barely as such is not a Sacrament: For if it were, then could it not derive its Sacramental Use and Nature from Christs Institution: For, its own aptitude, if men had pleased to use it, and determine it, had been sufficiently productive

ductive of its Sacramental Use and Nature: If they did not, what confidence can we put in Councils that have mistaken in such weighty Cases? The truth is, at this rate of speech they have secured their seven, and made sufficient room for twenty thousand more.

3. If Sacrament only import a Secret, then *Babylon* it self becomes a Sacrament. Then Types and Parables, and all the Intrigues of Church and State are Sacraments, and so whatever needs Interpretation.

4. If by a Sacrament they mean the shadowing forth by signs of any thing of a sacred Nature, then there are more than seven. Then all the Furniture of the Tabernacle and Temple, and all the instituted Rites of *Moses* must have been Sacraments, and *pari ratione* all Gospel-Ordinances, Institutions and Transactions.

4. If by a Sacrament they mean all dedicating Signs, then there may be more than two. All Signs of Dedications unto Office and Relations, as well as all intire Christianity, may be called so. Thus if I lift my Hands or Eyes to God, or solemnly subscribe an Instrument whereby I give my self to God in any service, I make a Sacrament and receive it.

5. If by a Sacrament they mean, the Signification of a Vow or Promise in any kind to God: Thus Orders, Confirmation, *&c.* may be called Sacraments, and the signification of every thing I undertake for God, as Master, Servant, Subjects or Soveraign, may be called so; nor shall we say there are no more than two.

6. If by a Sacrament they mean something of Divine Institution, as expressive of some sacred Undertaking and Relation, I shall yet grant, there are more Sacraments than two. Thus Matrimony, Orders, Confirmation, Penance, and extreme Unction too, as stated and intended under those circumstances in *Jam.* 5. are Sacraments.

7. If by a Sacrament they mean something in some respects of the same nature, use and ends, with Baptisme and the Supper of the Lord, I shall grant there are more Sacraments than two. All Offices and Relations bind to respective Faithfulness. Confirmation is the fresh owning of the same Obligations which Baptisme laid upon us. I am called to regular Penance by both these Sacraments. I may remember Christ by reading, speaking, *&c.* I may signifie my owning of my Covenant, and may renew it by Fasting, Praying, and Professing many wayes.

8. If by a Sacrament be meant some significations of the Grace of God to me, both Relative and Real, so there may be more Sacraments than two. Thus every Ordinance, Providence, and thing, expressive of Gods Grace to me, may bear the Name of Sacrament. All helps, encouragements and advantages for Heaven and Holiness, do clearly signifie Gods Care and Kindness to me. Thus the Apostles Ministry may be a Sacrament, as a clear indication of Gods kindness to him.

9. There are some Sacraments of Order that may be truely such, as Holy Orders, Matrimony, and of Office, Civil, Oeconomical and Ecclesiastical, whose root may be the Covenant of Grace. But Sacraments of Christianity import something more. Thirdly,

Thirdly, As to its more reſtrained and intended uſe, a Sacrament is a ſtated Ceremony ordained by Chriſt, made up of viſible Signs; whereby our hearty dedication, and full conſent to all the terms and tenders of the Covenant of Grace, and Gods acceptance of us thereunto, is ſignified, ſolemnized and ratified by God and us, according to the Propoſitions and Injunctions of the New Teſtament. Which when it is proved, will make it manifeſt, that either their aſſerting of Seven is a moſt ſhamefull and abuſive noiſe, both of provoking and dividing Words, or else of deep and dangerous miſtake in Things, and too weak to bear their *Tridentine Anathema*. Now if we view the whole deſcription in its parts, we muſt conſider theſe things, to ſtate and clear the Caſe in hand. 1. Whether the whole was not intended in the firſt uſe and accommodation of the word *Sacrament*, to the concerns of Chriſtianity? 2. Whether all this be not included in *Baptiſme* and the *Euchariſt*? 3. Whether it can be poſſibly included in any of the five Sacraments beſide?

1. Therefore, as to the firſt Uſe and Application of it, to the Caſe in hand, 'tis clear it was thus uſed by *Tertullian*, and by him applyed to Baptiſm: For ſpeaking *ad Martyres*, about their ſolemn Abrenunciation which was made in Baptiſm, and about other Interrogations propoſed at the ſame time; *Vocatis* (ſaith he) *ad militiam in Sacramenti verba reſpondimus*, &c. *And thence* (ſaith he) *did the whole action receive its Name.* And ſo *adversùs Praxeam*, *Fides in Patrem*, *Filium & Spiritum ſanctum ſecundùm Chriſtianorum Sacramentum*, *&c.* Which muſt at leaſt oblige us to, and influence all ſuitableneſs of ſpirit and practice to the ſacred Trinity, according to their ſeveral *Titles* and Relations to us, according to *Rom.* 6. 3.—— 6. And on the ſame account the *Greeks* called our two Sacraments *Myſteria*, and the Church generally underſtood the word in this ſence, in oppoſition to the Heathens initiation of their Diſciples into their Idolatrous Religions; and thus the Ancients write of only two Sacraments, as *Tertullian*, *Juſtin*, *Irenæus*, *&c.* Though *Tertullian* mention indeed Unction, and Impoſition of hands, *de Reſur. Carn.* yet doth he not relate them as diſtinct, but as appendent Ceremonies to Baptiſm. Thus alſo *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* intends the ſame of Chriſme. The time would fail, to ſpeak of *Dionyſius*, *Ambroſe*, &c. And it is manifeſt, that the Doctrines of the ſeven Sacraments were not ſtarted, till broached by *Hugo* and *Peter Lombard*, from whom the Papiſts at firſt ſuck'd it, and terribly have they improved it, to bring about their moſt miſchievous Ends.

2. As to the ſecond, that this deſcription doth ſuit the *Euchariſt* and *Baptiſm*, is no diſpute. Whence *Bellarmine* himſelf reflecting upon *Chemnitius*, who aſſerted eight things as conſtitutive of a Sacrament, in that ſence that Baptiſm and the Euchariſt are ſuch: As, 1. A viſible material Element or Sign. 2. A Divine Inſtitution of it. 3. And that Command in the New Teſtament, and inſtituted there. 4. And this to the End of the World. 5. Attended with a Promiſe of Grace. 6. And this

this annexed to the Sacramental Sign, and cloathed therewith even by divine Ordination. 7. And this Promiſe comprehending all the benefits of our Redemption in cloſe and full Relation to eternal Life. 8. And all this ſigned, ſealed, offered and applyed *virtute Dei*, to all that entertain theſe Sacraments by Faith. Hence *Bellarmine* inſtead of denying the truth and full Propriety of this Application, attempts to prove them applicable unto Penance, and thence would argue it to be a Sacrament.

3. As to the third, whether the other five can be as truely and fully called Sacraments with equal correſpondence to theſe eight particulars, this muſt be tryed by an equal ballance, and true examination of all particularly: And therefore the five Sacraments which muſt be brought unto the teſt, are theſe. 1. *Confirmation.* 2. *Extreme Unction.* 3. *Matrimony.* 4. *Orders.* 5. *Penance*, which is transferred unto the laſt, to introduce the reſidue of my Work.

1. As to *Confirmation.* What Elements are made the viſible and proper ſigns? By what Inſtitution is it ordained? and by what Promiſe of Grace, with reſpect to Pardon and Eternal Glory, is it encouraged and annexed? Or wherein will they fix its common and adequate relation and proportion to the two great Sacraments? What is their Confirmation (by Chriſme on Infants) for the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt, but an audacious Apiſh imitation of miraculous Operations by the Apoſtles hands? Nor can their equivocal juggles about the Promiſe of the Spirit relieve them in the Caſe, if the gift thereof as ſanctifying and comforting, of equal neceſſity and extent to all times and Chriſtians, be diſtinguiſhed from its miraculous and extraordinary Operations and Diſpenſings, which was to be appropriated to that ſealing Age, both as to Chriſtians, and extraordinary Officers and Circumſtances.

2. As to *Extreme Unction*, grounded upon *Mar.* 8. *Jam.* 5. when they can prove that theſe things are to be referred to ordinary and perpetual Ceremonies in the Church, throughout all Ages, and not to the extraordinary circumſtances and Ceremonies of a Sealing day, wherein 'tis neceſſary that the Goſpel be ſealed and proved by Miracles at its firſt introduction into the world, they are more like to win the day, and prove their Unction Sacramental. But do not their own *Waldenſis*, *Alphonſus è Caſtro*, and famous *Eſtius* himſelf conclude, that *James* and *Mark* ſpeak of Miraculous Cures? Were not the parties to be anoynted, ſtricken and held with great Diſeaſes, partly contracted and deſerved by grievous Provocations, and partly inflicted to illuſtrate that miraculous Power which was then on foot. What though there be ſomewhat of analogy betwixt bodily diſeaſes, and ſin it ſelf, yet certainly Oyl had been more proper to the *vitium* than the *reatus* of their ſins: An analogy is requiſite in a Sacrament, and the Promiſe *Jam.* 5. is of Remiſſion, and Oyl that may have ſome Analogy to wounds, bears little or none to ſpots, or guilt of puniſhment.

3. As to *Matrimony*, who made it a Sacrament under the New Teſta-

ment? Or what is there in the Ordinance to make it anſwerable to the thing? and if it be a Sacrament, yet 'tis but œconomical, and it is no more divine than as it is an inſtituted Relative ſtate by God; and ſo is the Covenant betwixt Maſters and Servants: And thus the Inauguration of a King may be a Civil Sacrament. But a Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace is made compatible to all Believers: But this is not ſo, but the Prieſt muſt be barred from this Sacrament, leſt it impair his Purity. But they alleadge, it is called a Myſtery, *Eph.* 5. 31. and have not the Woman and the Beaſt the ſame Name? *Rev.* 17. 1. yea, doth not *Cajetan* affirm this place no argument that Matrimony is a Sacrament? Aware 'tis like he was of that which followes cloſely in the Text, *viz. I ſpeak of Chriſt, &c.* What trifling ſubtleties do they (the Papiſts) uſe to amuſe the World, as if they did deſign to be more ſtudious to walk in darkneſs, than to prevent or heal the wounds and breaches of the Church.

4. As to *Orders.* Though this may be a Sacrament of Order, and *truely ſo*, yet is not that commenſurate with a Sacrament of Chriſtianity. All are not Miniſters that may be poſſeſs'd of preſent Grace, and have a title to Remiſſion of ſins and everlaſting Glory. And it ſeems ſomething odde, that one Sacrament of the ſame Covenant, ſhould make men uncapable of another. As alſo that two different Sacraments inconſiſtent on the one hand, ſhould have the ſame ſign. And it is yet more ſtrange, that this ſhould be equal to Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, and yet ſhould want a viſible Element for its ſign.

5. And as for *Penance*, (as far as God requires it, and ſtates its uſe and nature) doth not Baptiſm relate and bind us to it? Is it not Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of ſins? What is the external Right? And where is the acceſſion of the Word unto the Sign whereby it muſt be made a Sacrament? What is there in this Penance commenſurate with Baptiſm.

Fourthly, As to their many Reaſons amongſt the Schoolmen for their Septenary number, let them name any thing ſubſtantial, that is not reducible to theſe two Sacraments. Their ſeptenary number of different Conditions, or Vertues, or Diſtempers; theſe two Sacraments will comprehend them all: for they contain what is fully ſuitable to every ſtate, urges to every vertue, and tends to cure our ſpiritual diſtempers; and what need we Seven of theirs, when Chriſt hath inſtituted Two to do the work? But let us conſider what they ſay. We will inſiſt upon the Reaſons therefore, whereon they would eſtabliſh the Septenary number of their Sacraments, and anſwer them.

1. They tell us, that the Number *ſeven* is famous, and of frequent uſe and ſtrict importance in the Scriptures; as *Aarons* Garments put on by his Sons ſeven dayes, the Attonement for the Altar ſeven dayes, Blood ſprinkled ſeven times, *Naaman* waſhing ſeven times: Thus 'tis a number famous in Expiations, and otherwiſe; hence now *Eliphaz* muſt take

ſeven.

ſeven Bullocks, and ſeven Rams, and go to *Job*, *ch.* 42. *v.* 8. Seven Gifts of the Spirit, and thus ſeven of the Apocalyptical Seals, Trumpets, Starres, *&c.* To which I anſwer. 'Tis wonderfull, they took no * notice of this too, that the number of ſeven commenced from the compleat finiſhing of Nature as to its Order and Exiſtence, and Gods reſting from his Labours; all which was done within a Septenary of dayes, making the firſt week as it was in the beginning.

* Since the writing of this Head I have found ſome Papiſts inſiſt on this very thing.

2. Were this digeſted into an Argument, thus it would run: Whatever Number is of famous uſe and mention in the Scripture, muſt be the Number of Sacraments, under the New Teſtament, of the Covenant of Grace. But ſeven is ſuch a Number, *&c. Ergo* —— 'Tis the Number of Sacraments, and conſequently, there are ſeven. And what if the major Propoſition be denyed, will they not be ſorely exerciſed to prove it? what if we charge the Number in the Minor, and ſay, that One is the Number of famous uſe and frequent mention, will it not then be found, that whatſoever anſwers this *Medium* for One, will do their work for ſeven? I mean to anſwer it. How many Ones are uſed and mentioned *Eph.* 4. 4, 6? One God, Chriſt, Faith, Baptiſm, Church, Spirit, Hope, Heaven, *&c.* What do they think of two Lights or Luminaries, two Tables of the Law, two Cherubims, two Covenants, two Commandements? What do they think of Twelve Patriarchs, twelve Tribes, twelve Apoſtles, twelve thouſand ſealed, twelve Gates, *&c?* Are theſe therefore Twelve Sacraments? and ſo of other Numbers. Now if this Argument be followed cloſe, they muſt be brought to this, That either this is no Argument for their Number of Sacraments, or that their Number muſt riſe and fall according to what Number we ſhall pitch upon, and ſo there may be one, or two, or ſeven, or twelve Sacraments, &c. and ſo in what ſence, and why ſo many and no more. And further, thus the Reaſon would preſs as hard for ſeven Sacraments under the Law as Goſpel: and as to Expiations and Conſecration, do not two Rams, two Goats, two Turtle-doves, or two young Pidgeons, bid as fair for only two Sacraments, as ſeven of other things can bid for ſeven Sacraments? And thus much for this Argument ſetcht from the congruence or apt agreement of Numbers.

2ly, Let us take notice of thoſe Arguments which *Aquinas* brings for the proof of ſeven Sacraments. *Part.* 3. *Queſt.* 65. *Art.* 1.

1. The Analogy or Proportion betwixt Natural and Spiritual Life. And here 'tis worth enquiry, whether all they ſay be not intended in theſe two. 1. For the *Eſſe per generationem:* This is deſignedly in our Baptiſm, which is the Laver of Regeneration, conſidered relatively, as we are baptized into new Relations, to which our cordial acceptance in capable ſubjects (I mean the adult) is abſolutely neceſſary before God; and a Profeſſion thereof (probably ſerious) before the Church. And whether this be Grace or no, let it be conſidered for the doubting under its proper head. And as for thoſe that talk of inward, real, ſubjective

Grace, by the Application of the outward Elements, and that this Grace is in the Elements, they must assert this to be wrought at the rate of a Miracle; which, when 'tis proved to be wrought by proper, necessary, instituted Resultancy from the Sacraments, shall be assented to. And I believe they will find it hard to prove subjective Grace wrought by the Sacraments themselves, otherwise than by moral objective Influence. And whatever else is wrought, is done by some distinct Operations of the Spirit, even as 'tis done when the Word of God is made to work effectually. And as for the rest, the same answer will serve them all. As Increase in Confirmation, Nourishment in the Eucharist, medicinal reparations of the lapsed by Penance, removal of the reliques of Diseases by Exercise and Diet, to which they make Extreme Unction to be analogous; Orders in relation to publick Exercise, to compleat vital Perfection; and Matrimony for the propagation of an holy seed. For these I would fain know, whether the two Sacraments which we plead for and they own, do not referre to all these things, in that they bind us to, and in their kind help us in all that is pretended as designed by the other five? And as for Confirmation, doth it bind us to, or seal to us any thing new, distinct materially from Baptism? Or is it not rather (orderly dispensed) the renewal of the Baptismal Covenant.

2. As for what is alleadged by way of remedy, against distempers, or in relation to those distinct Graces and Vertues wherein we are concerned. Both are considered, and abundant Provisions against the one, and for the other, are made in these two Sacraments, so far as they are proper to Christianity as such. And so speak all Christians as such, to be concerned in them. And if any thing falls out to some that is not incident to all, 'tis fit that it be referred to its proper head, in Order, or Prudence, or the like. And if they will contend about the name of Sacrament, let them have it, provided that in things they will distinguish (and let us understand they do so) betwixt what is a Sacrament of Order, and what is a Sacrament of entire Christianity. And that they will explain their own *Tridentine* words, *Caranz. Epit. Conc. in Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. cap. 3. de Sacram. in gener.* See *Rainolds* against *Hart*, in his *Confer. chap.* 8. *div.* 4. *p.* (*mihi*) 602.

And having now dispatch'd the point of the seven Sacraments (about which I could have spoken more, but that I care not for those Controversies that are made so intricate by a resolved espousing of words and phrases, whose sence is arbitrary and undetermined) amongst which, Penance was transferred unto the last, it will not be amiss to make some short reflections upon the Popish Doctrines of Humane Satisfactions, which they make a branch of Penance, and with Contrition and Confession to be constitutive of it.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. *Cap.* 8, 9. *Rom. Catech. de Satisfact.* The Councel of *Trent* asserts it false and alien from the Word of God, to say, That the fault is never remitted by God, but the whole Punishment is pardoned too. And so the *Trent* Doctors striking harmony with the

the *Roman* Catechiſm aſſert, That when God forgives a Sinner, he yet forgives not all the Puniſhment, but leaves the party by his own works to ſatisfie till it be waſh'd away; and theſe works are all good Actions inward or outward, proceeding from Vertue, as Confeſſions, Almes, Faſtings, Prayers, Sufferings in this Life, or in Purgatory: and the things that we ſatisfie God for by our good works, are 1. Temporal Puniſhments. 2. The Reliques of ſin. 3. The fault it ſelf. 4. The ſame Puniſhment wherewith the Damned are afflicted, Eternity only being abſtracted from them. And here we muſt conſider, 1. How they *diſtinguiſh*, 2. What they *conclude*, and ſo how far they come to us, and wherein we part.

I cannot now ſpeak to this head or part of humane Satisfactions largely, but I ſhall content my ſelf at preſent with ſome brief touches and reflections thereupon. For this matter is *diviſim & membratim* more cloſely and fully handled by others in this Exerciſe.

Firſt, For the Diſtinctions; they are upon three Heads principally. (1.) They diſtinguiſh upon Sin: and they tell us, that it is conſidered here, as 1. Either before Baptiſm; or 2. After Baptiſm. 1. That before Baptiſm is either Original or Actual: and 2. That after Baptiſm is conſiderable either in (1) Relation to its Object moſt immediately concerned, which is either 1. God, or 2. Man; (though in the general notion every ſin againſt Man is againſt God too, whoſe Lawes are broken by our Irregularities as to our ſelves, or one another;) and then as in relation to its (2) Quality or Aggravation, 'tis either *venial* or *mortal*: And here you muſt conſider, 1. The Fault, 2. The Stain, and then 3. The Puniſhment; which we transferre to be conſidered as the next Head of Diſtinctions: where we ſhall conſider it; and to the other part, 'tis thus replyed.

1. Sin is conſiderable in the general Notion as a tranſgreſſion of the Law of God. Now the Law is transgreſs'd in reference to either our Hearts or Actions. Sin in the Heart is conſiderable as to (1) Its Derivation into the Heart or Nature of Man, by Original tranſmiſſion to all the children of apoſtate *Adam*: Or, (2) its Intereſt and in-dwellings in the Heart, and corrupting prevalent influences upon it. And ſo here we muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt, 1. What God doth as an offended righteous Ruler in a courſe of Puniſhment, making ſevere and juſt reflections upon our Nature becauſe of the violation of the Law of our Creation: And, 2. What is done by Man as under the circumſtance of his Primitive Forfeiture and Diſeaſe, which our Parents firſt miſcarriage brought into the world. And then we ſay, (1) God juſtly might and did withdraw that Spirit of Holineſs from *Adam* which he by ſinning thruſt away, and left him in that ataxy and diſorder which man ſo willingly threw himſelf into, ſo as that he had no Holineſs and Rectitude to tranſmitt to his Poſterity. And, (2) Apoſtate, and thereupon corrupted *Adam* cou'd not communicate a better Nature to Poſterity than he had himſelf. Nor, (3) Was God bound in Governing Juſtice to ſet his Seed under ſuch comfortable Circumſtances as he did ſet himſelf: And (4) the rather becauſe the Miſeries of all his Seed was part of the Puniſhment which was due to him; even as their Holineſs and Felicity ought to have been a powerfull motive

motive, and ſhould have been a ſure reward to his Obedience, and continuance in his due Integrity. Now 2ly, As to its in-dwellings and intereſt in the heart, and dreadfull Influences upon it, they ſtill abide in ſome meaſure, and are owned and acknowledged in our Baptiſmal Covenant, wherein we do accept of the Spirit as our Sanctifier, which he could not be unleſs we were defiled, and acknowledged our ſelves to be ſo. Nor can we any more conclude the perfection of the Sanctification of our Natures, by our being baptized into the Holy Ghoſt, than we can conclude our perfect Glorification and Salvation by being baptized into the Father and the Son; all being to be wrought and perfected in a way of gradual motions, proficiently, anſwerably to thoſe healing Rules and Remedies that are before and with us, to be obſerved and improved by us. And as to ſinfull actions, they are the products of our ſinfull hearts; and we promiſe to prevent them (as much as in us lies) for time to come, even as we do profeſs and exerciſe Repentance for what is paſt and gone. And here our Covenant-cloſures, and anſwerable Converſations afterwards, are no further ſatisfactory unto God, than as they anſwer his commanding will, as our Obedience to him, and as the performed Conditions of our Salvation which God hath made ſuch.

2. Sin in relation to its Object, is either againſt God or Man; conſiſting either in doing what we ought not, or not doing what we ought, and as we ought to doe, with reference to all thoſe circumſtances and relations in which and under which we ſtand as to God and Man, either our ſelves or others; and on both theſe we ſhould or do reflect with an anſwerable frame of ſpirit thereunto, as far as our miſcarriages have been and are known to have been committed againſt God or Man, or both. And here [by God,] I mean the ſacred Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: and thus our ſins before and after Baptiſm are the ſame as to their formal Nature, (*viz.* they are tranſgreſſions of the Law of God whenever they are committed) although by ſome acceſſary circumſtances they may differ in degree: And thus 'tis true, that to break the Laws of God after the ſolemn Vow of Baptiſm to the contrary, is worſe than to do it before, and may require ſome ſmarter Diſcipline and Repentance, in that the Obligation of a Vow that is made (and ſuch a ſolemn Vow is Baptiſm) doth greatly aggravate the ſin; and hence, 'tis likely, did ariſe that primitive Penance impoſed upon Profeſſors lapſed after Baptiſm into Heatheniſm, or other ſcandalous miſcarriages, in order to their own Recovery and Eſtabliſhment, the ſatisfaction of the Church about the uſefull truth of their Repentance, with reference to their reſtauration; the vindication of the Purity of Chriſtianity, againſt the Calumnies of others; and the prevention of the Revolts of others; and ſo the quickning of all to regular Care and Watchfulneſs about their perſeverance and proficiency in Chriſtian Growth and Godlineſs; that ſo thereby it might be manifeſt in the eyes of all about them, how much the Rules and Diſcipline of Chriſtianity did ſecure, promote and quicken

quicken all Righteouſneſs, Sobriety and Godlineſs, at the higheſt rate in the world.

3. Sin in relation to the ſtrength and meaſures of its Malignity, and as it referres to the Quality of our ſtate, is either conſiſtent or inconſiſtent with the ſtate of ſaving Grace. And here it is not ſo much to be conſidered what is lawfull or unlawfull, as what is poſſible or impoſſible to be in a truely Regenerate Heart. 'Tis poſſible, a good Heart may not do every thing that is required of him, and yet it is unlawfull to let the leaſt thing be by him neglected. I have yet met with none that dare declare and ſtand to it, That there hath never been the leaſt remiſneſs or neglect that by their utmoſt poſſible care could be prevented, ſince they were firſt converted unto God; but all, in every thing they do with God, and for God, dread to be dealt with according to their beſt performances in exact proportion to their merit. We do depend upon Chriſts Merits and Interceſſion, and uſe his Name to beg our pardon for Irregularities even in our holieſt performances; and certainly the ſerious Heart will dread to complement with its God. And therefore when the Papiſts talk of *venial* and *mortal* ſins, and tell us that Mortal ſins can have no ſatisfaction but from Chriſt, but Venial ſins may be ſatisfied for by our ſelves; let them but freely tell us what they mean. 1. Is any ſin ſo venial as that it cannot merit the Wrath of God hereafter, by any Law which he hath made? Is not the tranſgreſſion of Gods Law the formal Nature of ſin? doth not that very Law pronounce every delinquent worthy of Death? is not Death the indication and execution of divine diſpleaſure? Is not Death comprehenſive of all Miſeries, as it was ſtated in the ſanction of the firſt Law? Are not ſins dignified from their Object? a gentle ſtroke when given in Anger, though in its nature it be but little, yet if given to a Prince, receives another ſtamp and character; and as to God, if the matter be great, there is no diſpute but the ſin is great, as Blaſphemy, *&c.* if it be ſmall, the ſin is great, becauſe the great God is denyed his will; although his claims were mean and eaſie as to the matter of them. Did God bid us do ſome great thing, would we not do it? how much more when he commands what is but ſmall for us to do, would not the neglect ſavour of great contempt even in a ſmall affair? 2. Do they by *venial* ſins mean ſuch as do not prove our full revolt from God, becauſe 'tis poſſible ſuch a ſin may be committed by one that yet doth hold to God as his great and only End and Reſt? why then We own as well as They, that every fault and ſlip proves not a perſon to be forthwith Graceleſs. 3. Do they by *venial* ſins intend ſuch ſins as do or may be pardoned upon Repentance, Faith, and New Obedience? if ſo, it will put them ſorely to it to mention any ſin, though never ſo hainous in its nature (the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt excepted) which a right hearty, practical Repentance and Faith in the Lord Jeſus, *&c.* may not obtain the pardon of; and in this ſence no ſins are *mortal* but thoſe which unavoidably bring the Soul to Hell at laſt, and that through final Infidelity.

and I

and that through final Infidelity and Impenitence: and hence we ſhall the better underſtand what can be meant by theſe ſins being to be ſatisfied for by us, and in what ſence they may be ſo. For if they mean, that the Blood of Jeſus was not needfull to make them pardonable upon thoſe terms, propoſals and conditions of their pardon, which God hath tendred in the Goſpel; Chriſt is apparently contemned and undervalued: But if they mean, that the pardon will not be had unleſs the Conditions be performed by us, it is moſt true; and if they mean ſomething elſe, they muſt declare and prove it to us.

(2.) As for the Things for which our *Satisfactions* muſt be made, they tell us, they are, 1. Temporal puniſhments; as (1) All the Miſeries of this Life in relation to our Bodies, Goods or Name. (2) Death it ſelf. (3) The pains of Purgatory, which are loſs and pain, the ſame with Hell it ſelf in Kind and Nature, though different in Duration, and it may be ſomething in Degree. For as to the Eternity of pains in Hell, 'tis but an Accident thereof; and for Subſtance we muſt ſatisfie: For the Eternity thereof Chriſt is reſponſible, who hath made them temporal that they might be removed by our ſatisfactions. And then we muſt ſatisfie 2. For the Reliques of ſin: 3. For the Fault it ſelf: And 4. For the Puniſhment of the Damned in Hell, if the Eternity thereof be but abſtracted from it. To which I anſwer,

1. Whoever is concerned to make Satisfaction, is conſidered either in relation to Property as a Debtor, &c. or in relation to Law as a Malefactour. Now as to the caſe in hand, as Sinners are looked upon as Debtors, ſo they relate to God as their Proprietary and abſolute Lord of his own; and ſo they may be look'd upon as having taken, or detained from God ſomething that is not theirs but his, which yet he might have parted with, and yet do himſelf no hurt; or elſe ſomething which they have neither right unto, nor can God part withall without his prejudice or dammage. If in their former ſence the thing be taken, 1. Then Satisfaction demanded from our ſelves, or from another, rather reſulted from Gods Will than from his Wiſdom. For it had been no incongruity for God to have retreated from his Right, where neither his Truth nor Wiſdom is concerned to forbid it; for who can blame a Creditor for want of Goodneſs, (when there wants nothing elſe) in that he doth forgive a Debtor? 2. Then there was no need of Satisfaction in the Caſe. God's ſingle Power could have recovered his own again. 3. For God to have his own again was all that he could look for. In that he had no prejudice but the meer alienation of his own again, and that not ſo much from his Property as his Poſſeſſion: For no mans Apoſtaſie from God could rob God of his title unto the Man, for that is too faſt and abſolute to be changed. And if God be only concerned as to his Poſſeſſion; when his Goods are come again into his own hands, no greater Satisfaction can be made. 4. When God hath all his own again, there can be nothing left to make him Satisfaction with, ſeeing God hath a right to all

that

that we can do as our Proprietary, and ever had, and could never juſtly be denyed it. But ſecondly, if you take the matter in the latter ſence, as ſomething is taken or detained, unto Gods real prejudice and dammage. 1. Then alſo Gods Omnipotence could have repaired his loſs. But, 2. Nothing can poſſibly impoveriſh God, whoſe abſolute and infinite Happineſs and Riches are nothing but himſelf, whoſe Property is abſolute, and his Omnipotence its full ſecurity. But now, if our ſins ſpeak a relation to a violated Law, and ſo God be conſidered as a Ruler, then we muſt mean, that we muſt compenſate that injury which in the courſe of Government we have already done to God, by the diſhonour we have done him in contradicting Gods righteous Will, breaking his Laws, and diſturbing or diſſolving his fixed courſe in Government; or we muſt do ſomething elſe that ſhall as well ſecure the Governours Honour, anſwer his Ends and Will in Government, as our deſtruction for our folly can amount to; and what that is, we poſſibly may underſtand hereafter, as the Papiſts do interpret and intend it.

2. As to the things for which theſe humane Satisfactions are required, they are it ſeems, (1) Temporal Puniſhments. But, 1. Is it not ſtrange, the Puniſhment ſhould be born in our own Perſons, and in its kind too, and yet that ſatisfaction ſhould be made at the ſame time too? Is it good ſence to ſay, that there muſt be, *Redditio ejuſdem*, the payment or reſtoring of the ſame thing exacted, which is the bearing of the Penalty, and yet at the ſame time doing or bearing *equivalentis*, ſomething proportionable and in lieu thereof. 2. As for the Pains of Purgatory, I ſhall leave that to a better Pen, that is concerned in that head; and thither I referre the Reader. 3. As to Death it ſelf, are voluntarineſs, and Patience ſatisfactory here? if ſo, for what? Is it the ſtroke of Death? why is it not then diſpenſed with, and ſo we made immortal, to ſcape that dreadfull blow? and further, why may not ſuch a frame of patience and ſubmiſſiveneſs prevent the ſtroke? what makes them ſatisfactory? is it becauſe they are pleaſing unto God? then *Enoch* ſatisfied for his death, and therefore ſcaped it, *Heb.* 11. 5. and yet another doth as truely ſatisfie for death, that bears it, as he that bears it not. 4. As to thoſe other Puniſhments in this Life, the holieſt man may have them all, and oftimes feels them more than he that never was ſolicitous to pleaſe his Maker, or make him ſatisfaction. It is not at the choyce of any, whether the puniſhments that God inflicts ſhall be born or no; and Nature teaches men to chooſe the gentleſt ſtrokes; and if the ſufferings of this Life be not voluntary, undue, æquivalent, they make not compenſatory ſatisfaction. 5. As to thoſe Reliques of ſin, what ſatisfaction are they capable of, diſtinct from their being purged away bythe Grace of God in the due uſe of proper Means, and from our Releaſe as to their binding of us over to the wrath of God, and the due ſentence of his Law? 6. As to the Fault it ſelf, how, and in what ſence is it capable of our ſatisfaction? Can any thing make it true, that I was never guilty of the fact I did?

That a Sinner hath been a Sinner is an eternal Truth, after delinquencies and faults committed. Can any thing make it true, I ought to have done what I have done amiss? can any thing make it true, that what was done amiss never deserved the wrath of God? or that it was not just and fit, that he who broke the Law of God should dye? Can any thing make it warrantable, that I should break the Law of God, or safe for me to do it, when God saith it is not? And when you have considered in Sin, the fact and faultiness, and the chargeableness of both upon the Sinner, and the truth of all, and have prescinded these in the consideration of its being satisfied for by us; you will find it can in no sence be capable of satisfaction, but as to our being purged from its commanding, or released from its condemning power. And can I do any thing for God that can be as gratefull to God, as it would have been to him that I had never sin'd against him? or can any thing be done by me that can do equal service to my Rulers will and honour, and the due Ends of Government, with my perfect Innocence and Obedience? or can I do any thing for God, that in strict proportion of desert can merit any being cleansed from the stain and blemish which a fault hath left upon me? If not, then let the Papists tell me in what sence a fault can be capable of our satisfactions, that shall keep it from connoting, either 1. Punishment, and so it is no further pardoned than the Punishment is remitted, or 2. Purgation, and then it doth import no more than being sanctified or reformed: From whence it follows, that their fundamental Maxim is a precarious though confident Assertion and Conclusion, or an ambiguous Cheat, *viz.* That they that say, *That the Fault is never remitted by God, but the whole Punishment is pardoned too*; speak that which is false, and in no wise owned by the Word of God. For, 1. 'Tis evident, that nothing can make an Act that was sinfull when committed, clear from the charge and censure of having been a fault; and in this sence, sinfull Actions are incapable of Remission, and therefore forreign to the case in hand. 2. If they mean hereby, (I mean by a Fault remitted) the extirpation of a sinfull Principle, and prevention of the same sinfull Action or miscarriage in kind; and so that this may be in many who are not excused from the just inflictions of miseries of Life, and pains of Death. 'Tis granted, that the best men alive are not unjustly dealt with, if they be visited with the Punishments of Life and Death, because of the Garden-quarrel, and those corrupted Natures which were derived thereby, together with our personal delinquencies. 3. But if they mean, by the Remission of a fault, God's taking off those Punishments, and discharging from the sentence of the Law, whereto the Fault had bound me, the remission of the Fault and punishment are of the same extent.

(3) They distinguish upon satisfaction, and say that satisfaction either doth relate to rigorous Justice, or to gratuitous acceptance. (1.) The former cannot be made by any thing but, 1. What is our own; 2. What is undue; 3. What is of equal dignity and value. And these things (say they)

they) cannot be attributed to any but Christ himself, who alone can *Deo paria reddere*. But then (2) the latter Satisfaction is by Gratuitous Acceptance, and so, by the favourable Condescension of the offended Ruler, men may satisfie as far as God will give them assisting and accepting Grace; and thus what with the Spirits help by inward Grace, and the tincture of the Blood of Jesus by Gods Grace upon our works to make them satisfie, we being one with Christ our Head, and communicating of his satisfaction for us, derive that merit from him into our works, which make them satisfactory; which works being the works of the Spirit, and coming thence, derive a certain infinity and equality, whereupon ensues the Grace of Evangelical Councels, whereby we are exhorted and perswaded to what we are not commanded, and thereupon it followes, that we have something that is our own, and undue to God, and therefore satisfactory, and the more easily satisfactory because of the third Grace of Remission, which removes the Eternity from the Punishment, and makes it temporal, that so our satisfaction for it may be more possible and easie. So then, that may be done by Grace for satisfaction, which in strict Justice is impossible; and then do but consider what 1. God enjoyns you to; as vehement and intense Contrition, and this will do your work for Death and Purgatory, outward laborious works, as Fastings, Prayer, *&c.* as also Almesdeeds. 2. Consider what may be enjoyned by others, as the Priests enjoyning the visitings of Shrines of Saints, so many *Ave*'s and *Pater Noster*'s, and other Penance. And 3. What you may do your selves, by voluntary Pilgrimages, Fastings, Scourgings, Sackcloth, Weepings, Prayers in such Numbers and Measures, and all other severities by self-punishment; and set upon these with an intent to satisfie, and the punishment of your Sins will be revers'd; because these things are more than you are bound to do, or God required of you. I pretermit the points of Indulgences, Purgatory, and other mens Satisfactions, for they are the Business and Employment of better Heads and Pens, engaged in this Morning Exercise. And as for Treasuries, and the Popes power to dispense them, I think if he can do it, he is bound to pardon all on Earth, and release those in Purgatory; and lives in *mortal* sin if he love not his Neighbour as himself: And I believe, were he in Purgatory, he would thank those kindly that would release him quickly; and then the Precept binds him to do as he would be done by. But on the other part, these Reflexions may suffice which follow.

1. *Satisfaction* is defined by the School-men, by a voluntary Reddition of something equivalent, otherwise undue; (for so the word *satis* doth import, and *satisfaction* signifies something that is sufficient) and *sufficiency* imports an equal correspondence of that which is returned, to that for which it is returned, and that both *in Beneficiis & Pœnis*, in Benefits and Punishments: And hence it followes, that he who returns less for sin than Divine Justice doth exact, doth not satisfie, although he doe to the full what is enjoyned him by his Confessour. Though yet he doe

Alteinst. in Lexico Gabr. dist. ib. qu. 2. Artic. 1. ex Scoto in dist. 3. qu. 1. lib. 4.

doe *aliquam pœnam peccato ſuo debitam ſolvere, ſoluturus in futuro quid minus injunctum eſt, & ſolutum in præſenti*; yet even here they are not agreed in the Caſe. For though thoſe mentioned in the Margent aſſert this Doctrine, yet others ſay, that Satisfaction is not to be made by ſomething otherwiſe undue; as *Durand. d.* 15. *qu.* 1. *Cajet. Tract. de Satisfact. q.* 1. and *Angleſ. in flores Queſt. part. prim. Queſt. de Satisfact. p.* (*mihi*) 253. concludes, That works otherwiſe due *ratione Præcepti*, as commanded, if they be done in Grace, are ſatisfactory for the Pains of Purgatory; and Martyrdome is his inſtance, and he tells us, that he is injurious that prayes for a Martyr to him; and this he makes to be the ſence of *Cajetan* and *Durand.* But to addreſs our ſelves unto the Caſe in hand: Satisfaction being the doing of ſomething that is ſufficient, hath a relation to either, 1. Commutative Juſtice, relating as to perſonal Debts or Injuries; and here the ground of his demanding Satisfaction that is wronged, or Creditor, is his own perſonal juſt Intereſt and title to what he claims, and the juſt Meaſures of our Satisfaction are to be fetch'd from both the juſt intrinſecal value and worth of what we are to make him ſatisfaction for, and alſo its relative worth to him whoſe loſs by the abſence of his own proper Goods, and all the dammage that accrues to him thereby, muſt have its equal compenſation from him that is Debtor or Injurious, unleſs ſome other accidents (as the Debtors inability, or Creditors diſtance, or the like,) make it impoſſible to make this ſatisfaction; and then, *nemo tenetur ad impoſſibile.* Or, 2. It relates to Diſtributive Juſtice, as the wrong which doth require our ſatisfaction may relate to Law and Government; and here the Rulers Honour and the Ends of Government, muſt give and ſtate the Meaſures of our Satisfaction; for in the whole, our Satisfaction, if truely ſuch, muſt bear proportion hereunto; and then whatever (upon the whole) doth exceed the bounds and claims of Gods Propriety, Excellence, Authority and Beneficence, and all that merit which doth and muſt reſult herefrom, cannot be called undue, and therefore amount to ſatisfaction in the ſtrict ſence. But in a comprehenſive and large ſence, God may be ſaid to be ſatisfied in ſeveral ſences. 1. As his Will is pleaſed by doing what is demanded of us under our preſent or ſuppoſed Circumſtances, and thus we ſatisfie his will as far as we doe what he commands us. 2. By Reparation of the Governing wrong and injury that is done him; and thus that ſatisfaction which muſt anſwer the wrong that is already done by our Apoſtaſie from God, is and can be only made by Chriſt. But that injury which would enſue from the Impunity of Delinquents, (here I mean ſuch Delinquents as finally reject the Remedy that God hath given them by Chriſt) muſt be compenſated by their own bearing of their deſerved and entailed Penalty; and thus God is ſatisfied againſt their wills by their effectual tranſmiſſion to their deſerved wracks and tortures. Or, 3. By perfect innocent Obedience to the whole Law; and they that challenge, let them maintain, poſſeſs and prove it, or 4. By a full anſwering of Gods vindictive

And the ſame *Angleſ.* concludes a little after, That the Prieſt can *imponere pro ſatisfactione peccatorum opera alias debita*, and for their differences through moſt of this Doctrin of Satisfact. ſee *Whites way to the Church*, pag. 133.

vindictive Justice, by suffering here what is equivalent to the full latitude and importance of their deserved punishments in Hell; and where is that self-austerity and discipline here in exercise, or possibly to be met with, that is equivalent to God's revenging strokes and wrath in Hell? Who hath an Arm like God, to strike like him? Or who would if he could, afflict himself at the proportionable rate of Gods omnipotent revenge, whenas the prospect of Christ's approaching Cup had such impressions on his Heart and Countenance? But we pass on to the next Head.

2. *Satisfaction* is here spoken of under a double Notion and Relation, and so divided into, (1) That which referres to strict and rigorous Justice, or (2) To Gratuitous Acceptance. In the former Christ only is concerned, as only capable of making it; because what Christ did, and was to do as satisfactory, was 1. His *own*, 2. *Undue*, 3. And of equal *value* and *dignity*. But in the latter, our capacity is large and good. And here we have, 1. The *matter* of our possible Satisfaction. Some things voluntary; Pilgrimages, Fastings, *&c.* Some things enjoyned (1) By God, as vehement and intense Contrition, laborious works and Almes-deeds, *&c.* And (2) By the Priest, as the visiting of Shrines of Saints, so many *Ave's* and *Pater-Nosters*, with other Penance. And then we have, 2. The Grounds and Means whereby our voluntary and enjoyned works are ripened into such Dignity and Value as shall make them satisfactory: Namely, (1) God's condescending and accepting Grace. (2) The tincture of the Blood of Christ, our Union to him, and communicating of his Satisfaction, from whence our Works derive their Merit. And, (3) The inward workings and assisting Grace of the Spirit, by which our works proceed from inward vertue, and so derive a certain Infinity and Equality. So that now the door is widely open to Evangelical Counsels, to which you are exhorted and perswaded, but not commanded.

1. Then let us hence consider, How far Christs Satisfaction doth extend it self, and see what room there is left for Humane Satisfactions, that so we may the better find and fix them, and so consider them more exactly in their proper Place and Office. And (1) They here acknowledge, that the Matter of Christ s Satisfaction (besides its being undue, and his own) is of equal dignity and value; but then I ask, with what is it of equal Dignity and Value? Is it not with the injury which he as Governour received by the Apostasie of his Creatures? Or with that Rectoral gain, which he would otherwise get from their destruction, or both? What injury could God be capable of, but contradicting his governing Will, ecclipsing of his governing Honour, and preventing or obstructing his noble Ends in Government, whereby it was made and rendred unbecoming God to place his heart upon, and distribute his choycest Blessings to the Sons of men, in such methods, and upon such terms, as might make his Subjects justly think, he was grown regardless of his Honour,

Honour, Laws and Government. Revolted man must either be destroyed or saved; if he be ruined, the glorious explications of Gods incomprehensible Love and Wisdom, by pardoning Grace and Mercy, in such consistency with his Truth and Holiness, had been prevented, together with such wise supplantings of Sathans Projects, Hopes and Triumphs, as *Now* he is effecting in his Gospel-methods; and the Revivals of Religion in an Apostate Tribe. Had man been saved immediately, without the execution of Gods violated Law upon him, and any equivalent consideration in the Case, the glorious Effects and proper Demonstrations, and so all suitable and usefull apprehensions of governing Justice, Wisdom, Holiness and Truth, so dear and proper to the Ruler, had been prevented; and both their Honour and essential Existence had been exposed unto the jealousies and suspicions of his Subjects; the Trust and Title of a Ruler had not been answered by its due administrations and discharge; Hopes of Impunity had been started, notwithstanding aftermiscarriages, to the great prejudice of Laws and Government, and suitable Obedience thereunto. And hereupon, nothing amounts to satisfaction that brings not things unto this Issue, That sinfull and Apostate Mans Salvation shall as much secure, promote, and speak the Harmony and Honour, of Gods whole Name as Governour, and all his Ends in Government; as mans destruction. (2) They must acknowledge, that Christ hath only and effectually satisfied his Father thus far, by what he did and suffered, as that Repentance, Faith and New Obedience, are by the Covenant of Grace made the Conditions of our full Recovery and Salvation, so as that they who fulfill the Conditions of the Gospel shall reap the Blessings of it. (3) Nor are they able or ready to deny, that all assisting and accepting Grace, and all the Means of Grace subservient thereunto, only result and issue from Christs satisfaction. Nor (4) Will they say, that any thing in Man without respect to the Redeemers Satisfaction, and the Fathers arbitrary, compassionate and condescending Grace, could have deserved of God to be accepted as a sufficient ground for readmission to his favour, or a sufficient compensation of our demerits. For, what Christ did was needless, if the great Ends thereof could have been answered and attained by us without it. They dare not say, that God was bound in Justice to accept of that *without*, which now is made acceptable *by* Christs Satisfaction. (5) Therefore the Meritoriousness and availableness of their supposed or asserted Humane Satisfactions, must (in their judgements) be derivative from Christ, and that assisting and accepting Grace that comes, must be upon the reckoning of Christs Satisfaction. (6) Whatever is commanded by God in Christ upon the penalty of otherwise forfeiting all the Benefits of Christs Satisfaction, and our Eternal Happiness thereupon, can be no further called Satisfaction, than as our stated Doing of what is commanded as our Duty, and as the Condition of our Salvation performed by us; which can no further merit our Impunity, than as God hath promised

promised and entailed that to and upon what is required of us.

2ly. Let us consider, what this *Satisfaction* by gratuitous Acceptation doth amount unto, and in what things we are to fix it. And, (1) Whatever is accepted or acceptable, is either so from its own intrinsecal value, and then as such it cannot be acceptable beyond its worth; or from its Usefulness and Aptitude unto its Ends. I know a little in another sence may be accepted as a testimony of thankfull resentments of favours, or an acknowledgement of distance, duty, subjection, &c. but this is not to the Case in hand, is [acceptable] but as expressive of the temper and purpose of the Heart, were but the ability answerable to the heart? And then we must consider the Nature and Degree of its mediate usefulness, as also its consistency with other means at hand, or instituted; for if it cannot be used, but some better Means, and more gratefull to him that is most concerned in the End that must be prosecuted and attained unto, must be neglected, it cannot be acceptable. And hereupon 'tis worth considering, how far their voluntary or imposed Satisfactions justle out those needfull Exercises and Duties that in Society must be done, and all those exemplary and Encouraging Influences which we are bound to give to others by our own chearfulness, praise and joy in the possession and improvement of what we doe and may enjoy with God, and for him: Or it must be judged acceptable from some clear and grounded Testimonies and assurances from God, either mediate or immediate, that he will accept our voluntary Offerings as Satisfaction; and under the discovered Notion and respects in which the Ruler tells us they shall be accepted, we must use and offer them. Now it is plain, that whatever God exacts from us, is to be referred to either his Authority, and so it must be done as Duty; or to his Wisdom, and so it must be done by vertue of that proper tendency it hath unto its End, and then the End must give the just proportion to the Action, and also Duty cannot be avoyded in the Case. For should Gods Councels be neglected, we make reflections upon his Wisdom, and tell him, That though he hath advised us to such a way or course, yet we have discovered another course as good; and if we quit Gods councel and espouse our own, we practically tell him, that our way is better; and then that will prove strange Satisfaction, and *humane* with a witness, that hath contempt of God and his Advice inviscerated in it, or wrapt up in its bowels: Or it must be referred unto his Holiness, and so it must be expressive of his Image upon our Hearts. And what Relation the matter of meer Humane Satisfactions have hereto, (besides that shew, *Col.* 2. 23.) it will be hard to prove: Or it must relate unto his Covenant, Compassions, Grace and Love, and so be performed as its Condition, and then that doth import Command, and something more. And therefore, (2) Gratuitous Acceptation doth hold out something in the very Name and Notion, that might most justly be refuseable even as Satisfaction, and speaks a retreat in God from what he justly might demand, though

Satisfaction

Satisfaction were admitted and concluded on; which they themselves allow, by their distinguishing it from that Satisfaction which hath respect to rigorous Justice. (3) Many things are excluded from being Satisfaction, from the consideration of their being commanded, as things that must be done, as ever we hope for Life and Glory. As 1. Whatever hath a true and proper reference to Gods Glory, 1 *Cor.* 10. 31. And 2. Whatever doth promote, become, and is expressive of our universal powerful Love to God and Man, *Mat.* 22. 37,—40. And 3. Whatever as to the Matter of it is true or honest, just or pure, lovely, or of good report, and that hath either prayse or vertue, *Phil.* 4. 8. 9. it is a comprehensive claim. 4. Whatever is proportionable or suitable in Measure and Circumstances, to our Abilities, Places, Gifts, and Offices, 1 *Cor.* 7. 17. 1 *Pet.* 4. 10, 11. And thus to Fear God, and keep his Commandments, is the whole of Man, and in these things must he be tryed for Life or Death at last, *Eccles.* 12. 13. And now when these things are discharged, there will be little left for Satisfaction-work; and I believe it will put them sorely to it, for to name any thing under present circumstances, that is materially worthy of a Man or Christian, that can escape the Claim and Discipline of these Commandments, especially if you take in that comprehensive Text, *Tit.* 2. 12. and well consider the special indispensible Duties of every Relation, in Families, Church, and State, and also what we are bound to doe to credit Christianity, and to promote its interest, influences, and repute, to the Recovery and Salvation of all about us. These things shall be accepted by Gods favourable Condescension, in order to our everlasting Happiness on the account of Christ, as readily, heartily and effectually, as if we had never sinn'd, or satisfied for our sins our selves, notwithstanding all former Laws, and provocations to the contrary. Duty discharged is gratefull to God, and Gods commanding Will is satisfied, as far as things commanded are performed. And the fulfilling of fœderal Conditions do satisfie and are available to the enstating of us in Covenant Rights and Priviledges, as far as the Covenant of Grace hath made them forcible and pleadable to these ends. And no other satisfactions can be, in whole or in part, necessary and available to procure this Covenant of Grace, and make the mercifull, moderate, gracious conditions thereof required of us, to be performed by us, so pleadable and effectual to their Ends in our Recovery and Salvation, as Christ hath made them. And they, if they would leave their Clouds, and face us in the open light, might see, that Satisfaction, if Humane, which they talk of so much, cannot be found in sence, if any thing be meant thereby, save pleasing God in doing his Will, and answering those Proposals, and fulfilling those Conditions on which we may attain and reap the Benefits of Christs Satisfaction; which Conditions would not have done our work, had not Christ by vertue of his Satisfaction deserved and obtained of God to give us Life upon such low and gracious terms; and how then can they find another sence or place for Satis-

No works of ours could joyn with this that Christ did undertake and do for his Satisfaction is of it self entire, compleat and successfull.

Satisfaction by their works? let them but freely tell us where it lies, that any works of ours can be satisfactory, and for what they can be so: As to the first, wherein their value for Satisfaction lies, let them deal freely with us. Is it by something derived from Christ or not? if not, they had been as available as now they are, if Christ had never dyed for us; for the substance of eternal Punishments may now be done away, and their Eternity had been nothing without their Substance; for the Eternity of that which is not, is but a meer Chimæra: And as to Death, that universally and unavoidably entailed stroke on all, Patience and Voluntariness would have satisfied, but for what? not for the stroke, for that is born, and who would satisfie for what he cannot escape by Satisfaction? is it not hard to pay something equivalent, and bear the stroke withall? for Satisfaction is not *ejusdem* but *equivalentis*; and if it be some worse punishment, he that destroyes the Substance of the Punishment, need never fear the Eternity thereof, although there should be no Satisfaction; but this will need no further confutation. If then the value of our works for Satisfaction be derived from Christ, it is either done by his Allowance, or by his Ordination, or by meer Advice: if by meer Allowance, this is no more than Lawfulness by bare permission; and if this be enough to make a Satisfaction, then every thing neither commanded nor forbidden will do the work: And this absurdity needs no loads, it being unable to bear it self; but if it be by Ordination from Christ, where is the Order? what is the place and quality thereof? is it instrumentally causal? then let them shew wherein. Is it as a Condition constituted in a Covenant-way? where then is the Covenant that can make it so, and hath entailed this Promise on it? Is it by meer and bare Advice? if so, all councel doth result from skill, and wisdom, and kindness too, in either reality or pretence: If therefore such works be inexpedient means, there is no Friendship nor Wisdom in the Case; for nothing can be advised by Wisdom that is not adviseable in the case; for this must be resolved into Will, not Wisdom: *Sic volo, sic jubeo*; and then it ceases to be at our liberty, because it is commanded: And if it be expedient in the Case, 'tis either so by absolute Order, and then Neglect is sinfull; or proper Tendency, and then God hath made it so; and Christs advice is the discovery of his Fathers will, and then Gods Authority makes it Duty, and our great and absolute Concernment makes it necessary; and thus, *arbitrary* can it no longer be. For I am bound to take the most proper and expedient course and way to bring about my best Concernments and Designs, as far as they are laid within the compass of my utmost possible Knowledge. And therefore, here I am under Duty and Commandment still; and if I can serve God better by Vows of Poverty, Chastity, *&c.* or any other Evangelical Counsels, than otherwise: the Male of the Flock ought to be offered up to God, and given him; and 'tis a strange course for Satisfaction, to take a meaner and more improper course, when other wayes are made my Duty. I cannot be allowed to satisfie for Punishment by the

neglect of Duty, or by remisness in it. Nor can it be imagined by us, what references the imposed visiting of the Shrines of Saints, or such a Number of *Ave's* or *Pater Nosters*, can have to compensate my sauks to God, seeing Apostate and depraved Man had rather travel far, and say a many Prayers (as being truely and apparently a more easie task, and in the eyes of wicked men readily taken so to be) than to leave sins and fall to thorow-duty here, or bear the flames of Hell for ever, yea or in Purgatory, were there such a state and place. Nor are these courses likely to prevail on others for timely, universal and effectual Reformation and Conversion. And for the second, for what they can satisfie; this will bring us to consider the second general head.

Secondly, What they conclude either by *Concession* or *Denyal*. And here they grant that Christ hath satisfied for sins before Baptism, Original and Actual; for *mortal* sins after Baptism, for the Eternity of Punishment, for our former incapacity of making Satisfaction, which is deducible from this, in that they make such grace so necessary to our capacity of making Satisfaction, as could not come upon us unless Christ had satisfied before, namely, 1. The Grace of Justification, whereby the Spirit dwells in us, makes one with Christ, and interested in his Satisfaction, from whence that merit is derived into our works, that makes them to be Satisfactions too, though in relation to another head, *viz.* Gratuitous Acceptation. 2. The Grace of Evangelical Counsels, whereby something is rendred undue from us to God as being not commanded. 3. The grace of Remission, making eternal punishments temporal, to make our Satisfaction easie, and then 'tis plain, our *venial* sins and temporal Punishments may be satisfied for together, and with ease and great success by us.

To this I answer: All this hath been considered before, and answered, and therefore my weary thoughts and Pen shall close with some Reflections upon temporal Punishments and Satisfactions for them; and therefore (passing by Purgatory, as considered by another) temporal Punishments are either such absolutely, are entailed 1 Upon *all*, as Death, and that is considerable as to its stroke or sting: Or, 2. only upon *some*, and that as either consequent upon their own miscarriage in a natural or legal sence or meerly resulting from the wise but arbitrary Providence of God: And thus my replyes are these. (1) Nothing that Christ hath done, or Man can doe, can make us hope, conclude or think, the stroke of Death can be avoyded, *Rom.* 5. 12. *Heb.* 9. 27. *Job* 30. 23. For God hath no where promised that. (2) As to the Sting of Death, Covenant grace and Faithfulness, through Christ, can only pluck out that. Reflections upon Grace and Faithfulness at a dying hour, can only make our Souls triumph over their sorrowes, fears and jealousies, through the Apprehensions of our approaching Judgement and Retributions in an eternal State. Nor can I think that any will find relief at last from Pilgrimages, Shrines and Scourges, *&c.* if this Grace and Faithfulness be wanting. (3) As to

Strokes

ſtrokes conſequent upon our own miſcarriages, through our intemperance or imprudence, or miſdemeanours in reference to the Lawes of of God or Man. Our Temperance, Providence and Innocence through Gods good hand upon us, may prevent them as to their ſtrokes, and full Repentance, Faith and Holineſs may poſſibly allay, if not remove their bitterneſs and ſtrokes. (4) As to the Strokes that come by the arbitrary Providence of God, as the beſt men may not ſcape them, ſo Covenant-Faithfulneſs ſhall not loſe by them.

And thus you ſee by what is ſaid already, the ſence and grounds of what is controverted betwixt the Church of *Rome* and Us about this head of *Humane Satisfaction*, and thence you may gather what to ſay to what this Controverſie may be ſummed up in: The ſumme whereof lies in theſe following things, which they aſſert. As,

1. That all thoſe Afflictions and Temporal Chaſtnings which God inflicts on men with reference to their Graces, Sins, and exemplary uſefulneſs, are true Expiations of, and Satisfactions for their ſins paſt to Divine Juſtice. To which 'tis anſwered, 1. God ſatisfies himſelf in what he doth, in that his ſtrokes are grounded, proper, and ſucceſsfull to his Ends, to ſhew his Name, to execute his Laws, and ſo prevent all inconveniencies to his Name and Government. 2. They that endure theſe ſtrokes, and make a right improvement of them, do ſo far ſatisfie God, as ſatisfaction may ſignifie their pleaſing God, and anſwering his Ends in Diſcipline. 3. As far as this Improvement and regular bearing of Gods Diſcipline is a Condition of our eſcaping that ſmarter wrath which former ſins deſerved, ſo far the fulfilling hereof ſhall ſatisfie God, that is, anſwer his commanding and covenanting will ſo farre. But, 4. It is Chriſts Satisfaction only, and not any proper Merit in our ſufferings, as antecedent thereto, or abſtractedly conſidered therefrom, that makes our ſufferings of all kinds, and our carriage under them, available to theſe comfortable Ends and Iſſues of being pardoned and accepted.

2. That good Works, expreſſive of Repentance, Piety and Gratitude, and tending to promote Religion, Mortification, Self-denyal, *&c.* or preventive of further ſtrokes and Judgements, are truely ſatisfactory to God for ſin. *Anſw.* No further than as they, 1. Pleaſe God's ruling, his commanding and covenanting will (in which ſence God is ſatisfied but only as he is pleaſed:) And, 2. As Chriſt is conſidered in the caſe, to make them acceptable and available to obtain our Pardon and Recovery, and final Bliſs, by what he hath done and ſuffered and obtained for us.

3. That Penance impoſed by primitive Chriſtians upon the ſcandalous or Apoſtate, in order to their Cure and Readmiſſion to the Church with their conſent, and to their ſatisfaction, and other Chriſtian Ends, is now made a Satisfaction for their ſins to Juſtice. *Anſw.* God in Chriſt, and for his ſake, is ſo ſatisfied, (that is pleaſed) with our Repen-

tance, as our Obedience to his Command, our complyance with his Covenant-terms, our qualification in ſtate and temper for his further Image, Favour and Preſence, and all the Favours that conduce thereto, and reſult therefrom, and as our diſguſtings and bemoaning what hath been done amiſs, and preventing the lamentable Conſequences, of Impenitence, to both the Church and unbelieving World, as that where it is duely exerciſed and expreſs'd towards God and Man, in ſuch works as ordinarily and in ſpecial Caſes and Circumſtances, become Repentance, as that it ſhall ſuffice on their parts under Chriſt for their reſtoring to what their Scandals and Apoſtaſie bereaved them of. But it is only Chriſt that hath deſerved that our Repentance through Grace, and only Grace, ſhould reach theſe Ends and Benefits.

The ſumme of all is this, when we have abſtracted the Humane Satisfactions of the Papiſts from what God hath made our Duty, and the Condition of our Salvation, or from what is due to the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, from us as Creatures, Subjects, and delivered Sinners by Price and Power, to be trained up according to the Methods and Aſſiſtances of Goſpel Laws and Grace; and ſo from what I am bound to do to ſatisfie my injured and endammaged Neighbour, offended Governour, and the Church of Chriſt, according to the Inſtitutions, and for the neceſſary, and by God and Chriſt enjoyned Ends and Intereſt of the Goſpel; how narrow and uſeleſs will Humane Satisfactions appear to be?

And thus I have gone through this Task, as throughly, as Gods breaches on my Family, my manifold Diverſions, great Diſtractions, mean Abilities, and ſlender Furniture, and other Hinderances would admit of; and with my cloſing words, and to my laſt gaſp (if ſenſible ſo long) muſt I bewail the miſerable ſtate of Church and World, that muſt be ſcandalized, diſturbed, and divided, by wanton Fancies, prurient Wits, proud hearts, and ſiniſter deſigns, in having Doctrines clouded or ſophiſticated with dark and doubtfull words and phraſes impoſed on them.

SERMON

SERMON *XXI.*

There is no Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper.

1 Cor. XI. 23, 24, 25.

For I have received of the Lord that which alſo I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jeſus, the ſame Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread.

And when he had given thanks he broke it, and ſaid, Take, eat, this is my Body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me.

After the ſame manner alſo he took the Cup when he had ſupped, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

GOD hath exalted Man above all Creatures of the viſible World, in giving him a Being capable of Religion, and thereby of Eternal Life and Happineſs in the enjoyment of himſelf. And to the end that God may make himſelf glorious, in making loſt Man happy, he hath in infinite Wiſdom and Grace given us his written Word, to be a perfect Rule of that Chriſtian Religion, (*a*) by which we may obtain Eternal Life and Happineſs in God by Chriſt; in which Word he hath not only revealed this glorious Happineſs to us, *and brought Life and Immortality to light, through the Goſpel*; (*b*) but alſo told us, what gives us a title unto, and fits us for, and the way that leads unto the full poſſeſſion of it.

And therefore what tongue can expreſs the deſperate madneſs and folly of thoſe men, who forſake *the good Word of the Grace of God*, (*c*) for a Religion that hath no other Foundation than the words of lying men.

And ſuch is the Popiſh Religion, which as it is Popiſh, is deviſed only by

a *In his quæ aperte poſita ſunt in Scriptura, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, moreſque vivendi*, Aug. de Doctrina Chriſtiana lib. 2. cap. 9.

b 2 Tim. 1. 9.

c Act. 20. 32.

by Devils and Men, to feed luſts, and to ſerve a carnal and worldly Intereſt, and tends to the Damnation of millions of Souls.

Their Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* in the Lords Supper, which I am now called to bear witneſs againſt, is one of the chief Articles of this Religion; and if this falls, their Idolatrous worſhipping their Hoſt, their moſt abhorred propitiatory Sacrificing Chriſt in their Maſs, their Sacrilegious robbing the People of the Cup, and a great part of their Religion muſt fall with it; and yet by the Grace of God, I ſhall in this enſuing Diſcourſe make it appear, that *Tranſubſtantiation* is ſuch an hideous Error, that the very nature and clear Conſequences of it do crye of the true Chriſtian Religion, as they cryed of *Jeruſalem*, (a) *Raſe it, raſe it, even to the foundation thereof.*

a Pſal. 137. 7.

I ſhall therefore fall immediately to my work, which is to prove two things:

1. *That there is no Tranſubſtantiation in the Euchariſt or Lords Supper*; and take notice, that I do not queſtion but the name *Euchariſt* hath been anciently, and may be ſtill fitly given to this Sacrament, but I ſhall chooſe to call it according to Scripture, the *Lords Supper*, it being better known among us by that Name.

2. *That it is Idolatry in the Papiſts to worſhip the conſecrated Bread, though they think it is turn'd into the Body of Chriſt.*

Now becauſe in theſe words (with thoſe in the three Evangeliſts, *Matth.* 26. 26, 27, 28. *Mar.* 14. 22, 23, 24. *Luk.* 22. 19, 20, which I would be underſtood to take into my Text) the Inſtitution of the Lords Supper is fully and clearly delivered from Chriſt to his Church, and becauſe theſe words do carry us in a right line to the Author, and Nature, and Uſe, and Ends of this Ordinance; and are the true Standard by which we muſt try all Doctrines, and Opinions, and Practices touching the Lords Supper: and alſo becauſe our Adverſaries pretend to receive their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation from Chriſt in theſe words: I have therefore choſen them for the moſt proper Subject of this Diſcourſe.

And herein I ſhall proceed in this method.

1. I ſhall briefly acquaint you with the true Doctrine of the Lords Supper, taught by Chriſt in theſe words.

2. Acquaint you with the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, which the Papiſts pretend to receive from Chriſt in theſe words.

3. Prove that there is no Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper.

4. I ſhall make Application, and therein prove the ſecond Propoſition, viz. *That it is Idolatry in the Papiſts to worſhip the conſecrated Bread, though they think it be turned into the Body of Chriſt.*

Firſt, I ſhall give you a brief and plain account of the Doctrine of the Lords Supper, taught us in theſe word, in ſix particulars, which I ſhall further improve in the following Diſcourſe.

1. Jeſus

1. Jesus Christ hath in infinite Wisdom and Love appointed Bread and Wine for this Sacrament; this is evident by those words, *Jesus took Bread, and he took the Cup*, wherein was *the Fruit of the Vine*: Our dying Lord being about to institute and administer the Lords Supper, in Order thereunto he solemnly *took Bread and Wine*.

2. It is the Will of Jesus Christ that Bread and Wine be blessed and consecrated by the Ministers of the Gospel, this Bread and Wine must be changed from that common use, which they had before Consecration, by being blessed to a holy and spiritual and Sacramental use: This appears by our Saviours practice recorded in the Text, *Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and he took the Cup and gave thanks*: The word εὐλογήσας, translated *blessed*, and εὐχαριστήσας, translated *gave thanks*, do here signifie the same thing, and do assure us, that Christ blessed the Bread and Wine, which obligeth all Ministers in this Case to do the same; and therefore saith the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, and the Bread which we break*,--- meaning the Bread of blessing, which we bless and break; for both were blessed by our Saviour, and are to be blessed by his Ministers, and are thereby made *blessed Bread*, and *blessed Wine*.

3. It is the will of Jesus Christ, that this blessed Bread be broken by his Ministers; this was a holy Rite, or Action of Christ, recorded by the three Evangelists, and by St. *Paul* in the Text, which tells us, *he blessed the Bread, and brake it*; from which Sacred Rite, Expositors conceive, that this Sacrament is cal'd *breaking of Bread*, *Act.* 20. 6. and it is clear, that our Saviour made this Bread, as thus broken, to signifie *the Body of Christ, which is broken for us*; and therefore saith the Apostle, *It is broken Bread that is the Communion of the Body of Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. And though I cannot stay to quarrel with the Papists for lighter matters, yet take notice of their bold Superstition in affronting Christ herein, by making their Bread into little round Wafers, and not breaking it, but putting it whole into the mouths of the Communicants.

4. Jesus Christ hath appointed that this *blessed Bread, and blessed Wine*, be administred to Believers; this is clear by our Saviours example mentioned in the Text, which tells us, that *the Bread which he took, and blessed, and brake, he gave to his Disciples*; *and the Cup which he took and blessed, he gave to them.* Jesus Christ administred the blessed Bread and blessed Wine in this Sacrament.

5. It is the command of Jesus Christ, that Believers *do take, and eat, and drink*, this blessed Bread, and blessed Wine; for Christ gave and administred them with a command to take, and eat, and drink them; the words are clear, *Take, eat, drink ye all of it*; which Command the Disciples obeyed, and did take, and eat and drink the blessed Bread and Wine which Christ gave them; and so we see this blessed Bread and Wine passing from Christ to his Disciples in the Lords Supper, and eaten

and

and drunk by them: And therefore Christians be sure to hold fast these two things in the Lords Supper.

(1.) Never yield to part with the Bread and Wine out of the Lords Supper, for they are blessed, *destroy them not, for a blessing is in them*; all the Blessings that come from the infinite Love of God in Christ by the Covenant of Grace, for the Salvation of Believers, are *in this blessed Bread, and blessed Wine*, and if ye lose the Bread and Wine, ye lose those blessings as conveyed by them.

(2.) Take and eat, and drink this Bread and Wine as the Bread of Blessing, and as the Cup of Blessing, take the Blessing that is offered with them, for it is the Blessing that makes this glorious Feast of the Lords Supper.

6. Jesus Christ hath declared the use, which this Bread and Wine are blessed, and consecrated unto; in these words, *This is my Body, or this is my Body which is given, or broken for you. This Cup is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many*, &c. *or, this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.*

These words declare two main Uses, whereunto this Bread and Wine are blessed and consecrated.

(1.) To be Sacramental Signs, to signifie and represent to us Jesus Christ crucified, and all the Benefits of his Death; for the words do clearly speak of Christ crucified, and that with respect to us. *This is my Body which is broken for you; this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood which is shed for you.* And by Faith, whereby the Heart doth assent to the truth of these words, we do in this Ordinance discern the Lords Body broken for us, and his Blood shed for us, and have our Souls filled, and suitably affected with the holy knowledge and remembrance, and contemplation of Christ crucified for us.

(2.) To be a Seal to confirm the New Teastament or Covenant of Grace, whereby Christ and all the Benefits of his Death are conveyed to Believers; this appears by these words, *This Cup is the New Testament, &c.* and by the Apostles Explication of the words, *This is my Body,— this Cup is my Blood.* 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? and the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* Teaching us plainly, that by this blessed Bread and Wine, there is a Communication of the Body and Blood of Christ, and of all the Benefits of his Death, which Believers are made partakers of in the Lords Supper; and therefore we are commanded to take, and eat, and drink this blessed Bread and Wine, for this use also; which we do, not only by seeing Christ crucified as here represented to us, but also by accepting, and receiving, and feeding upon him by Faith as he is here offered to us, to be the most glorious Feast of our Souls. And although it is the great Duty of Believers to see and feed on Christ crucified, as revealed and offered to us in his Word, and by other Ordinances, yet this is proper

and

and peculiar to this Ordinance; for Believers to ſee and feed upon him, as he is repreſented and offered, and given in the appointed uſe of Bread and Wine.

And thus I have given you a plain and brief account of the Doctrine of the Lords Supper taught us by Chriſt in theſe words; and for your confirmation in the truth thereof, I ſhall commend three things to your ſerious conſideration.

1. That for the Matter of this Feaſt, the Papiſts cannot with their Tranſubſtantiation declare it to be greater, or more, or better than we do without it: For we ſay, Here is Chriſt and all that is purchaſed by his Blood; here is all that is revealed and conveyed to us from the infinite Love of God, by the Covenant of Grace; here is God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt in Covenant with us, to pardon our ſins, and to bring us through Holineſs unto Eternal Life and Happineſs in Heaven.

2. For the Gueſts, or Communicants, we declare them to be the holy Society of true Believers, who are in Union with Chriſt as his bleſſed Bride, and Spouſe, and Members.

3. We further declare, that all the glorious things of this Feaſt, are ſo far really preſent with theſe Gueſts, that their Souls do truely feed upon them, and are feaſted with them, but there is no neceſſity of a local preſence of the Objects of the Soul with the Faculties, to make up this Feaſt; but Believers are here feaſted by the remembrance of Chriſts Death, which is above 1600 years paſt, and by their hopes of Glory in Heaven, and at the Day of Judgement, which is to come; and in ſeeing by Faith the crucified and glorified Body of Chriſt in that place and Order which the Scriptures reveal it to them, though his bleſſed Body be at a local diſtance from them. And ſo according to this Doctrine you ſee ſufficient reaſon in all thankfulneſs to acknowledge, that the Lords Supper is ſuch a Feaſt as is for the honour of the great *Jehovah*, to entertain his beloved Children and Friends withall on Earth, till he call them to feaſt for ever with him in Heaven, without the Uſe of Bread and Wine.

Secondly, I proceed to acquaint you with the Popiſh Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which the Papiſts pretend to receive from Chriſt in theſe words: This Tranſubſtantiation is declared in the Councel of *Trent* thus. (a) *That by the conſecration of the Bread and Wine, there is made a Converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Bread, into the ſubſtance of the Body of Chriſt, and a converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the ſubſtance of his Blood, which converſion the catholick Church doth fitly and properly call Tranſubſtantiation. And if any ſhall ſay, that in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine do remain, and ſhall deny this wonderfull and ſingular converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the Blood of Chriſt, the ſpecies of the Bread and Wine*

(a) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 13. cap. 4. can. 2.

only remaining, which converſion the catholick Church doth very fitly call Tranſubſtantiation: Let him be accurſed.

But, ſaith *Solomon*, *Prov.* 26. 2. *As the bird by wandring, and as the Swallow by flying, ſo the curſe cauſeleſs ſhall not come*; And therefore let them *curſe*, but Lord *bleſs thou*, *Pſal.* 109. 28. For in defiance of their brutiſh Execrations, I do with deteſtation deny this monſtrous, and blaſphemous Doctrine; and do therefore proceed to the

Third particular, to prove, *That there is no Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper*, which I ſhall prove by theſe following Arguments.

Firſt *Argument.* The Scripture is not for Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper, but is fully againſt it, and condemns it; we have only the words of Papiſts for it, but there is not one tittle of the good Word of God for it; but although there is no Ordinance of Worſhip more fully and plainly delivered from Chriſt in the Scriptures, than this of the Lords Supper, yet therein is not the leaſt Foundation for Tranſubſtantiation, but God ſaith in effect of it as he did of that abomination of the *Jews*, *Jerem.* 7. 31. ---*which I commanded not, neither came it into my heart*; and if it came not into Gods heart, God forbid that it ſhould ever come into our hearts.

That the Scripture is not for, but againſt Tranſubſtantiation, will appear by examining thoſe Scriptures, which our Adverſaries alleadge for it; and they are principally theſe two, *viz.* The words in the Text, *This is my body, this cup is my blood:* and *Joh.* 6. where our Saviour hath a large Diſcourſe *of eating his fleſh, and drinking his blood:* Now I ſhall vindicate both theſe Scriptures from the ſence of the Papiſts, and make it appear, that there is not in them the leaſt warrant for Tranſubſtantiation.

I ſhall begin with the firſt, which they chiefly inſiſt upon; and here take notice that their whole Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is contained in theſe ſeven particulars, all which they pretend to prove from theſe words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood.*

1. They ſay that *conſecration* of the Bread and Wine is made by theſe words only. (*a*)

2. That by vertue of theſe words, the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine are turned into the Body and Blood of Chriſt: and this is their Tranſubſtantiation.

3. That after theſe words are pronounced by the Prieſt, there is no ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine remaining in the Lords Supper.

4. That the *ſpecies* or Accidents only of the Bread and Wine do remain in the Lords Supper, and theſe do ſignifie the ſpiritual Feaſt, and are eſſential to this Sacrament. (*b*)

5. That by vertue of theſe words, the very material Body and Blood of Chriſt are locally and corporally preſent in the Lords Supper, and are contained under theſe *ſpecies* or Accidents of Bread and Wine. (*c*)

6. That

a Sententia communis non ſolùm Theologorum recentiorum, ſed etiam veterum patrum, Chriſtum conſecrâſſe illis verbis, Hoc eſt corpus meum, Hic eſt ſanguis meus. *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 4. *cap.* 13.

b *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 4. *cap.* 6.

c *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 13. *cap.* 1. *can.* 1.

6. That with theſe *ſpecies* or Accidents of the Bread and Wine, the true, material Body and Blood of Chriſt are taken into the Mouths and Stomachs of the Communicants, and corporally eaten, and drunk by them. (*d*)

Vlt. That the plain and neceſſary ſence of theſe words, *This is my body*, is this, *viz.* This Subſtance contained under the Accidents of Bread and Wine, is my Body. (*e*)

d *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11.

e *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11.

Now I ſhall make it appear, that all theſe are Popiſh Inventions, contrary to the mind of Chriſt in the words, and for that end I ſhall ſpeak briefly in confutation of each of them.

(1.) To the firſt I ſay, that Conſecration of the Bread and Wine is not made by theſe words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*: but it is made by the Bleſſing of the Bread and Wine by Chriſt and his Miniſters.

1. That Conſecration is not made by theſe words is evident, becauſe theſe words do ſpeak of Bread and Wine already conſecrated, or elſe they cannot be true; for it cannot be ſaid truely of any Bread and Wine in the World, this *is* the Body, and this *is* the Blood of Chriſt, but only of bleſſed and conſecrated Bread and Wine.

2. That conſecration is made by the bleſſing of the Bread and Wine is alſo manifeſt; for it is by the Bleſſing that they are made bleſſed Bread, and bleſſed Wine, or elſe the Bleſſing was in vain, and Chriſt and his Miniſters were not heard in the Prayers and Thankſgivings which they offered to God for a Bleſſing on thoſe Elements; but if men would be concluded by Scripture, the Apoſtle doth fully decide this controverſie, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the blood of Chriſt?* &c. where we ſee plainly, that it is the bleſſing of the Bread and VVine which makes them the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

(2.) They ſay, that by vertue of theſe words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, the ſubſtance of the Bread and VVine are turned into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which converſion they call Tranſubſtantiation.

I referre you to all my Arguments againſt Tranſubſtantiation, to convince you of the falſhood and odiouſneſs of this ſence, only here take notice, that this cannot be the meaning of the words, for the words declare what the Bread and VVine are, *viz.* what they ſignifie, and not what they ſhall be when theſe words are pronounced, for it is not ſaid, Let this Bread and VVine be turned into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, but *This is my body, this cup is my blood*; which words being an affirmation of a Truth, do affirm and report that which was a truth before the words are ſpoken, and not that which by the ſpeaking of the words muſt be made true.

(3.) They ſay, that after theſe words are pronounced by the Prieſt, there remains no ſubſtance of the Bread and VVine in the Lords Supper.

This is ſuch a prodigious Errour, that they may as well ſay, that God would have all men turn Infidels and mad men, and go out of their ſenſes to become Chriſtians: but I ſhall here only give you three Reaſons againſt this Opinion, whereunto I ſhall adde more in the following Diſcourſe.

1. If theſe words deſtroy the ſubſtance of the Bread and VVine out of the Lords Supper, then Jeſus Chriſt did by theſe words fruſtrate and make voyd his own bleſſing of the Bread and VVine; and ſo did croſs his own will in praying for the Bleſſing, and his Fathers will in granting his prayer, for according to this Opinion, when Jeſus Chriſt by Prayer and Thankſgiving had bleſſed the Bread and VVine, he preſently utters words which makes them neither Bread and VVine, nor bleſſed; and thus they make Chriſt curſe his own bleſſing.

2. That Bread and VVine are in the Lords Supper, appears, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt himſelf did in this Ordinance adminiſter Bread and VVine to his Diſciples, and that with a command to them, to take, and eat, and drink Bread and VVine; which command the Diſciples obeyed, and did accordingly take, and eat, and drink them: for proof of this, weigh the words: *Jeſus took Bread, and bleſſed, and brake, and gave to his Diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eat, this is my body: In like manner he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood*, &c. Now *Bellarmine* (*a*) himſelf ſaith, "That it "cannot be doubted, but all theſe words, He took Bread, he bleſſed and "brake, and gave to his Diſciples; referre to the ſame matter of bread "which was in his hands. Seeing then that in our Saviours adminiſtration of the Lords Supper to his Diſciples, which is the ſtanding Rule and Pattern to all Miniſters and Chriſtians to the end of the world, we find Chriſt himſelf adminiſtring bread and wine, and ſee bread and wine paſſing in this Ordinance from Chriſt to his Diſciples, and Chriſt commanding them to eat and drink them; for what he gave, he commanded them to take and eat and drink; and they did accordingly take and eat the Bread, and take and drink the Wine. What prodigious folly and wickedneſs is this, to deny that Bread and Wine are in the Lords Supper?

(*a*) *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 1. cap. 11.*

3. The Apoſtle *Paul* himſelf doth no leſs than three times call it Bread after conſecration, and likewiſe tells us, that the Communicants do eat the bread, and drink the cup. See *v.* 26, 27, 28. *For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup,* ---- *Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord,* --- *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.* See Chriſtians how the Papiſts do contradict and quarrel with the bleſſed Apoſtle: *Paul* ſaith, that the Communicants do oft eat this Bread, and drink this Wine in the Lords Supper: The Papiſts ſay, that they never eat bread, nor drink wine. *Paul* ſaith, Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup: The Papiſts ſay, No man doth ever eat this bread, nor drink this cup. *Paul* ſaith,

Let

Let him eat this bread, and drink this cup: The Papists say, Let him not eat this bread, nor drink this cup. See, I say, the difference betwixt God and the Apostle on the one hand, and the Pope and Papists on the other hand; and choose whether ye will believe, for if God be to be believed before the Papists, there is bread and wine in the Lords Supper.

There are several Objections which the Papists make against this last Reason, I shall onely instance in two of the chief of them.

1 *Object.* The Scripture calls it bread, because it was once bread, as after *Moses* his Rod was turn'd into a Serpent, it is still called a Rod, *Exod.* 7. 12. and after the water was turn'd into wine, yet it is still cal'd water, *Joh.* 2. 9. So say they, after this bread is turned into the body of Christ it is still cal'd bread, because it was bread before this conversion was made.

Answ. The Scripture calls the Serpent a Rod, because that which was then a Serpent was before a Rod; and the Wine is called Water, because that which was then wine was water a little before; but Christs body never was bread, and therefore there is not the like Reason to call it bread.

2 *Object.* The Scripture often calls things not from their Nature, but from their outward Appearance to us. So the Angels that appeared to *Abraham* in the Likeness of Men are called Men, *Genes.* 18. and so because this hath the outward appearance of bread, therefore the Scripture calls it bread: This is *Bellarmines* Objection. (*a*)

Answ. As the Scripture calls it bread before consecration, because it is so, and hath the true Nature and Properties of bread, so it calls it bread after consecration, not because it is like bread, but because it is bread; for consecration doth bless the thing consecrated, but never destroyes it: and therefore this Objection is vain, because these Angels never were Men, nor had the beings of men, but only appeared in the likeness of Men; but this had the true substance of bread before consecration, as our Adversaries grant, and hath the true substance of bread after consecration, as we have proved, and for that Reason both before and after the Scripture calls it bread.

a *Bellarm: de Eucar. lib.* 2. *cap.* 14.

(4.) They say, that the *species* or Accidents only of the bread and wine remain in the Lords Supper, and these do signifie the body and blood of Christ, and are essential to this Sacrament: by *species* or Accidents is meant the colour, smell, sweetness, length, breadth, moysture, *&c.* of the bread and wine, and these, say they, ye see, taste, feel, smell, eat and drink, but ye do not see, nor taste, nor smell, nor touch, nor eat, nor drink Bread and Wine.

I shall only at present say two things against this Opinion:

1. This as our Divines well argue, is a plain contradiction, for the essence and being of Accidents is to be inherent in the Subjects which they are Accidents of; or else they subsist by themselves, and so are not

Accidents

Accidents but Substances; to instance in the present case: If there be whiteness, and redness, and length, and breadth, and heaviness, there must be some substance that is white, and red, and long, and broad, and heavy; or else the communicants must in the Lords Supper solemnly eat, and drink white, and red, and long, and broad, and heavy nothing.

2. There is the same Reason to deny that the *accidents* of Bread and Wine do remain in the Lords Supper, as to deny that the *substance* of them do remain there, for if these words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, do destroy the *substance*, certainly they must destroy *the accidents* too, for they are pronounced over the whole blessed bread and wine, and make no distinction between *the substance and accidents*, but speak the same of both together. And therefore I shall here expostulate this case with our Adversaries thus: when our Lord Jesus blessed the bread and wine, did he bless *the substance* with one kind of blessing, and *the accidents* with another? did his blessing on the Substance destroy it, and the same blessing on the Accidents preserve them? Or when Christ said, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, can they perswade themselves, that he therein said one thing of *the substance*, and another thing quite contrary of *the accidents*? So that by vertue of these words, the Substance of bread and wine is turned into the body and blood of Christ, and the Accidents of bread and wine are preserved without the *substance*, and appointed to signifie his body and blood; or if by vertue of these words *the substance* be destroyed, by vertue of what words are *the accidents* preserved, and consecrated to a use quite contrary to the use of the Substance? If they say, Their senses tell them, the Accidents remain there, we say and shall make it appear, that their senses and ours also tell us and them, that *the substance with the accidents* remain there also, and if Faith must conclude against the senses in the case *of the substance*, why must it not also conclude against the senses in the case of *the accidents*? but if against Scripture, and Reason, and Sense, the Papists will usurp a Power to keep and destroy what they please in this Sacrament, let us keep our *Lords Supper*, and let them take their *Popes Supper*.

(5.) They say, that by vertue of these words, the very material *body* and *blood* of Christ are locally and corporally present in the Lords Supper, and are contained under the Accidents of Bread and Wine.

I might plead many Arguments against this, but I must remember that I am limited in my work, and shall therefore give you onely one Argument to convince you of the falseness and madness of this Opinion, and that is this.

Arg. If these words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, &c. do make the *body* and *blood* of Christ to be locally and corporally present in the Lords Supper, then his Body crucified and dead upon the cross, and his Blood there shed out of his veins, are locally and corporally present in the Lords Supper. Observe Christians where these mens Principles lead them; I know our Adversaries do confess, that the body of Christ is no

where

where found dead since his Resurrection, and therefore saith *Bellarmine*, (a) *God doth not cause, nor ever will cause to all Eternity, that the Body of Christ be any where found dead*; yet I say, it doth necessarily follow this Doctrine, that his body is found dead upon the Cross, and his blood there shed in the Lords Supper; for if these words do make his body and blood locally and corporally present under the *species* of bread and wine as they affirm, then it must be his body and blood as these words do expressly declare, this is my body *broken for you*, this cup is *my blood shed for the Remission of the sins of many*; which words do clearly speak of his body crucified, and dead, and of his blood shed upon the Cross, and therefore the Apostle doth teach us, that in this Ordinance we *do shew forth the Lords death*; so that nothing can be more clear, than that by this Doctrine the bread and wine are turned into the dead body of Christ, and into his blood shed upon the Cross, and that his body crucified and dead upon the Cross, with his blood there shed, are locally and corporally present under the Accidents of bread and wine: And so by this Doctrine, Christs body was really and actually dead upon the Cross, and so present under the Accidents of bread and wine, when at the first Institution and Administration of the Lords Supper, he said, This is my body *given*, or *broken for you*; and this is my *blood shed*, &c. And also in despite of the Apostle, that saith, *Rom.* 6. 9. *Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more*; his body must be dead upon the Cross, and as so dead, must be locally and corporally present in the Lords Supper, under the Accidents of bread and wine, whensoever or wheresoever this Sacrament hath been, or shall be administred since his Resurrection to his coming to Judgement. And moreover, it must also follow from this Doctrine, that the very material Cross on which Christ was crucified, and all the Instruments of his Death, must be locally and corporally present at the Lords Supper, and the very Souldier that pierced him must be there present, piercing his side with a Spear; yea, the very hour of his Death, though so many years past, and the place of his death, so many miles distant, must be present in every time and place the Lords Supper is administred. Christians, these consequences are not forced, but these, and an hundred more such wild contradictions do necessarily follow this Doctrine, as appears to any who will but grant, that which cannot be denyed, *viz.* That these words, This is my body *which is broken for you*, this cup is *my blood shed for many*, do directly point at the body of Christ crucified and dead upon the Cross, with the manner, and all the instruments and circumstances of his death, as recorded by the Evangelists in the History of his Passion.

(a) Deus non facit, nec est futurus in æternum, ut Christi corpus alicubi reperiatur mortuum. *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 21.*

(b) They say, that with these *species* or Accidents of *bread* and *wine*, the true material body and blood of Christ are taken into the mouths and stomachs of the Communicants, and corporally eaten and drunk by them.

I have three things to say against this odious and barbarous Doctrine.

1. It

1. It aſſerts that which is *impoſſible*.
2. That which is *unprofitable* both to Soul and Body.
3. That which is *impious* and *flagitious*.

Firſt, This Opinion aſſerts a multitude of *impoſſibilities* and *contradictions*, and that in a very great and weighty point of Religion; now that ye may underſtand the ſtrength of theſe kind of Arguments, take notice, That when two things are affirmed that are altogether inconſiſtent, ſo that one of them fully deſtroyes the truth of the other; and if one be true, the other muſt neceſſarily be falſe; this is an impoſſibility, or contradiction; as to affirm, that the ſame man is dead and alive at the ſame time, is a contradiction, becauſe he cannot be dead of a natural death, and live a natural life at the ſame time. Now I ſay in this Opinion of corporal eating the *body*, and drinking the *blood* of Jeſus Chriſt, is a multitude of moſt horrid contradictions, which are found in three caſes.

1. In the caſe of *Jeſus Chriſt*, his eating and drinking the Lords Supper, for our Adverſaries agree with us, that Jeſus Chriſt did eat and drink the Lords Supper.

2. In the caſe of the *Diſciples*, at the firſt Adminiſtration of this Ordinance.

3. In the caſe of all *Communicants* ever after.

(1.) In the caſe of *Jeſus Chriſt*, his eating and drinking the Lords Supper; I ſhall here onely inſtance in three plain and groſſe contradictions.

1. That Jeſus Chriſt, did with his *body* eat his own whole *body*, and yet his body continue as it was before whole and uneaten, and ſo the ſame body was eaten and not eaten at the ſame time, and the Eater and that which is eaten is every way the ſame, and that which was eaten did eat the body, which was the Eater of it, in the ſame Action, and at the ſame time.

2. That the ſame *ſacred body* of Jeſus Chriſt was in all its dimenſions and proportions, ſitting at the Table in the view of his Diſciples, and yet was at the ſame time in his own mouth and ſtomack, and ſo either this one body of Chriſt was multiplyed into two, *viz.* one within the other; or elſe the ſame whole body, and fleſh, and bones, was incloſed in a little part of his own body.

3. That Jeſus Chriſt did drink his own precious *blood*, and that the ſame material blood of Chriſt was ſhed, and was in the cup, and did paſs out of the cup into the mouth and ſtomach of our Lord, and yet at the ſame time his blood not ſhed, neither did move out of his veins. Theſe are moſt filthy, odious, and hideous contradictions.

(2.) There are many contradictions in the caſe of the *Diſciples*, who by this Doctrine are ſaid corporally to eat and drink the material Body

and

and Blood of Christ, at the Institution and first Administration of the Lords Supper: For either they did eat and drink his body and blood, as he was then alive, before his death; or as dead and crucified with his blood shed on the Cross; or as glorified in Heaven, or as all these together. Now in every one of these there are many horrid contradictions.

1. If they say, that they did eat and drink his body and blood as he was alive before his death, then there are these two contradictions therein.

First, That his whole body was sitting at the Table with his Disciples, and also in the Mouths and Stomachs of his Disciples at the same time, and so every Disciple had the same whole body in his Stomach, which they all saw sitting before them at the Table.

Secondly, That his Blood was shed out of his body, and taken into the mouths and stomachs of his Disciples, and yet not shed but continued within his own body at the same time.

2. If they did eat his *body* dead and crucified upon the Cross, and and corporally drink his *blood* there shed; then his *body* was dead and crucified on the Cross, and dead in their Stomachs, and alive at the Table at the same time.

3. If they did corporally eat his glorified *body*, and drink the *blood* of his glorified body; then his body was glorified in Heaven after his death, and as such was in the Disciples Stomachs, and yet at the same time was upon Earth in the state of his Humiliation before his death.

4. If they did eat his *body* and drink his *blood* as alive, and dead and glorified, and so considered altogether; then his body was really alive before his death, and dead upon the Cross, and glorified in Heaven, and in all these cases, in the Mouths and Stomachs of his Disciples at the same time. These and many such blasphemous Contradictions are in the Disciples corporally eating the body, and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ.

(3.) There are also many plain and horrid contradictions in the case of all *Communicants* eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ, under the *species* of Bread and Wine, since the Institution and first Administration of this Ordinance. I shall only instance in this one.

That one and the same *body* of Christ which is a finite being, should be wholly in Heaven, and at the same time wholly under the Accidents of Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, wheresoever it is administred, and no where else in the World, and that this one body in Heaven should be wholly present with these Accidents, in all the Mouths of the many thousand Communicants in *Rome*, *Spain*, *France*, *England*, and in all other parts of the World where this Sacrament is administred; doth speak as many Contradictions as there are communicants in the world, and all as impossible, as it is for the same particular man to be preaching in a Pulpit at *Rome*, and at the same time to be preaching the same Sermon in all the Pulpits of the World. And thus I have shewed you, that

this corporal eating the Body, and drinking the Blood of Jesus Christ with the *species* or Accidents of bread and Wine, is *impossible*.

Secondly, It is *unprofitable*, and doth neither good to Soul nor Body. This appears by our Saviours words, *Joh.* 6. 63.---*The flesh profiteth nothing.*--- That is, the corporal eating the flesh of Christ profiteth nothing; and that this is our Saviours meaning, is evident; because it is the design of our Saviour in the foregoing words, to shew the Necessity, and the great Profit and Advantage of eating and drinking the *body* and *blood* of Christ spiritually by Faith; the Necessity hereof is expressed, *Vers.* 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no Life in you*; and this (saith Christ) is Profitable, as the Means of our Union with him, *Vers.* 56. *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*; and is also profitable to Eternal Life, and Happiness, *Vers.* 54. *Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day.* Now the *Jews* were startled at his words, understanding that he meant a corporal eating of his flesh, and therefore say they, *Vers.* 52. *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* This was such a Mistake as that of *Nicodemus*, *Joh.* 3. 3, 4. who when our Saviour spake of the Necessity of being born again, he wondered, and said, *How can an old man be born? can he enter the second time into his Mothers womb, and be born?* And the Disciples themselves understanding our Saviour in that gross and carnal sence of corporal eating his flesh, were offended, and said, *v.* 6. *This is an hard saying, who can hear it?* And therefore Christ explains his words, *v.* 63. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you are spirit, and are life:* That is, my words as you mistake them for a corporal eating my flesh, and drinking my blood, are not true; for the eating my flesh so profiteth nothing, but that eating my flesh, and drinking my blood by Faith in a spiritual manner, will make you blessed for ever; and so my words which I speak of this matter, are Spirit, and they are Life; and hereby it is manifest to all but such who study to corrupt and pervert the Scriptures, that our Saviour himself tells us, that corporal eating his flesh, and drinking his blood is altogether unprofitable. And I say it neither doth good to Body nor Soul.

1. It doth no good to the *body*, for it doth neither gratifie the Palate, nor allay or satisfie hunger or thirst, nor turns into any bodily nourishment, and so hath no use or property of bodily food.

2. It doth no good to the Souls, either of the Wicked, or of the Godly.

(1) It doth no good to the Souls of the Wicked, as our Adversaries themselves confess; and yet they will have this glorious *body* and precious *blood* of Christ to be taken corporally into the blasphemous mouths, and into the open Sepulchres of the throats of Swearers, and into the beastly

beastly mawes or stomachs of Drunkards and Gluttons; and within the rotten bodies of Whoremongers and Harlots, and there to lodge till the Accidents of bread and wine be digested, and then to remove no body knowes whither, leaving the cursed Inhabitants no better than he found them.

(2) Neither doth this corporal eating the *flesh*, or drinking the *blood* of Christ do any good to the Souls of the Godly, it kills no Sin, begets or quickens no Grace, yields no comfort, and indeed is not desireable to any wise and holy Christian, who never hungers and thirsts to have the body and blood of Christ in his mouth and stomach: Neither is it Christs way by entering into the mouths, and going down into the stomachs of his People to feed and feast their Souls; but *Christ is spiritually formed in their hearts*, *Gal.* 4. 19. and the Spirit doth *glorifie Christ in them*, *Joh.* 16. 14. and by the word and Sacraments their souls are feasted with the remembrance of his death, and with seeing him by faith *crowned with honour and glory* in heaven, *Heb.* 2. 9. and in their joyfull expectation of all the benefits of his death and resurrection, and intercession in the holy and blessed world; but the bodies of believers shall never meet the body of Christ till *they meet the Lord in the air, and so to be for ever with the Lord*, 1 *Thes.* 4. 17. but for this doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the mouths and stomachs of men which the frantick Papists would make us believe, it is a doctrine fitter to make our hairs stand an end, than to feed our souls, and is good for nothing, but to make the Popish Religion odious to all wise, and sober Christians.

Thirdly, I have this further to charge on this doctrine, that it teacheth a practice most horribly *impious* and *flagitious*: for to feed on mans flesh, and to drink mans blood was ever accounted a most barbarous transgression of all the rules of piety and humanity, and therefore this must be the height of that kind of impiety, to eat the sacred flesh, and to drink the precious blood of Christ in a corporal manner, which the Popish Cannibals teach men to practise; and which they pretend to prove both from the Text, and from *Joh.* 6. Against which odious sence, holy *Austin* pleads the same Argument, which I now use, saying, (*a*) "If there be a "Precept forbidding Sin, and commanding Good, it is not then a figu- "rative speech, but if it seem to command a horrible wickedness, or "forbid that which is profitable, then it is a figurative speech; and he "gives this Example in *Joh.* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of* "*Man*---- This (*saith he*) seems to command a most heinous wickedness, "and therefore it is a figurative speech, commanding us to communicate "with the sufferings of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably to lay up "this in our memories, that his flesh was crucified, and wounded for us.

(*a*) August. de Doctrina Christiana *lib* 3. *cap.* 15, 16.

But the Papists proceed in their Blasphemy, and are not ashamed to tell us, that if Dogs, or Mice, or Rats, or Worms, do eat the consecrated Host, they do therewith eat the body of Christ; and therefore according to their Wisdom they have provided in their Missal, (*b*) That if Rats, or

(*b*) Can 39. glossa in Can. 2. de Consecratione.

or Worms, do eat the body of Chriſt, they muſt be burned; what for Hereticks? becauſe their ſenſes took it only for Bread? but if their Hoſt be not God, why do they worſhip him with Divine Worſhip? and if he be God, why will they caſt their God into the fire?

And *Tho. Aquinas* their Angelical Doctor, as they call him, (and of whom they tell us this tale, that his Doctrine of the Sacrament was confirmed by this Miracle; a Wooden Crucifix miraculouſly ſaluted him with theſe words, *Benè ſcripſiſti de me Thoma*, Thou haſt written well of me *Thomas*) doth aſſert and plead for this dirty Ribauldry, ſaying, (*c*) That it doth no more detract from the Dignity of Chriſt to be eaten by Dogs and Mice, than his being willing to be crucified for our Sins. A goodly Argument for ſuch an acute Schoolman; as if becauſe Jeſus Chriſt in the ſtate of his Humiliation was willing to be crucified for our ſins, therefore in the ſtate of his Exaltation, he is willing that his glorified body in Heaven ſhould be eaten by Dogs and Mice: but thus they talk, as if their Doctors had ſate in the Council with Devils in the Gates of Hell, to debauch the Faith of Chriſtians, and to diſgrace the body of Chriſt.

c *Aquin.* ſum. part. 3. quæſt. 80. art. 3.

Laſtly, They ſay, that the plain and neceſſary ſence of theſe words, *This is my Body*, is this, this ſubſtance contained under the Accidents of Bread is my Body.

What I have already ſpoken to the former particulars doth fully conclude againſt this ſence; and yet I ſhall here adde two things againſt it.

1. That this ſence is inconſiſtent with their own Doctrine.
2. That it is repugnant to the true, and plain, and neceſſary ſence of Chriſt in the words.

(1.) That this ſence is inconſiſtent with their own Doctrine, appears in two particulars.

1. In their forcing two different, and both falſe ſences on theſe words, *This is my body*, *viz.* this ſubſtance contained under the Accidents of bread is my body, and theſe Accidents of Bread do ſignifie my body; and ſo the word *This* muſt both mean, *this ſubſtance*, viz. Chriſts body, and alſo *theſe Accidents of Bread*, and the word *is* muſt both be *is properly and eſſentially my body*, and is *figuratively and ſignificatively the Sign of my body*.

I know *Bellarmine* (*d*) ſometimes grants, that it is truly moſt abſurd, to ſay that by the word *This*, is meant *theſe Accidents*: yet the ſame *Bellarmine* tells, (*e*) "That the Accidents of Bread and Wine do ſignifie "the ſpiritual Feaſt, meaning as he explains himſelf, the body and blood "of Chriſt, and that the Accidents of bread and wine, as well as the body "and blood of Chriſt, do pertain to the eſſence of this Sacrament: Now that they force this ſence on theſe words, is clear, becauſe all their pretended Miracles in the Lords Supper, whereof the preſerving the Accidents without the Subſtance is one, are with them effected by vertue of theſe

d *Bellarm.* de Euchar. lib 1. cap. 11.
e De Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 5.

theſe words, and alſo becauſe Conſecration, one Effect whereof muſt be to conſecrate the Accidents of bread, to ſignifie the Body of Chriſt, is in their ſence made by theſe words: So that it is evident, that they diſtort theſe words, *This is my body*, to both theſe ſences, this Subſtance contained under the Accidents of bread is my body; and theſe Accidents of bread do ſignifie my body; which are ſo inconſiſtent, that all the Rope of Popes, can never be able to tie them together.

2. This ſence is inconſiſtent with their Doctrine, which teacheth, that the ſubſtance of the bread is turned into the body of Chriſt by vertue of theſe words: And ſaith *Bellarmine*, (*f*) in the laſt moment when all theſe words are ſpoken, then this Converſion is made; now to ſay, that the Converſion of the Bread into the body of Chriſt is not made till all theſe words are ſpoken, and yet to ſay, that the firſt word *this* doth demonſtrate Chriſts body, are plainly inconſiſtent.

(*f*) De Euchar. lib. 2. cap. 11.

(2.) I proceed to prove, that this ſence is repugnant to the true and plain, and neceſſary ſence of Chriſt in the words: for which purpoſe obſerve that excellent Rule of holy *Auguſtine*, (*g*) "It is as manifeſt an "Errour in the explication of Scripture to take figurative words proper-"ly, as to wreſt thoſe words which are properly ſpoken, into a Tropi-"cal or figurative ſence: By both which wayes of perverting the holy Scriptures, multitudes of Hereſies have troubled the Church of God. And this Doctrine of Tranſubſtatiation, with all the miſchiefs in Doctrine, Worſhip and Practice, which attend it, proceed from the Papiſts interpreting theſe words, *This is my body*, in a literal and proper ſence, which muſt be underſtood in a *figurative* ſence: The hinge of the preſent controverſie is turned upon theſe two words, *this is*; now I ſhall make it appear, that by the word *this* is meant this Bread, and that by the word *is*, muſt be meant, is a Sign, or doth ſignifie, and ſo that the true ſence of our Saviour in the words is this, *viz. This bread is a ſign of my body, or this bread doth ſignifie or repreſent my body.*

(*g*) *Auguſt. de Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ lib. 3.*

That by the word *this*, is meant this bread, appears by three Reaſons.

1. By the Order and Courſe of the words, by which it is plain, that of that bread, which Jeſus took, and bleſſed, and brake, and commanded his Diſciples to eat, he ſaid, This is my body.

2. Becauſe Jeſus Chriſt ſaith expreſſely of the Cup which he took, and bleſſed, and gave and commanded them to Drink. *This Cup* is the New Teſtament. So ſay *Luke* and *Paul* in the Text; therefore we muſt conclude, that of the bread, which he took, and bleſſed, and brake, and gave, *&c.* he ſaith in effect, This bread is my body.

3. St. *Pauls* Interpretation of the words may fully convince all, that the word *this* doth demonſtrate the Bread, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the blood of Chriſt? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt?* which ſpeak the ſame thing though in other words, as this bread is the body

body of Christ, this Cup is the blood of Christ; so that it is clear, that by the word *this*, is meant this bread.

Secondly, Hence it followes, that the word *is*, cannot be taken properly, but must mean, is a *sign*, or doth signifie or represent; it cannot be taken properly, for bread and the body of Christ are two Substances essentially different, and therefore it cannot be properly said, that bread is essentially Christs body. (*a*) But this is a sure Rule, that when the word *is* stands between the sign and the thing signified, then it must mean is a sign, or signifieth, or representeth. And this is the present case, the blessed bread is a sign of Christs Body, and therefore the meaning of Christ must be, This bread signifieth or representeth my Body, according to that known saying of *Augustine*: (*b*) *Christ doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body.*

Observe yet further, That whereas there is no Example in all the Scripture, of a Sign being turned into the thing signified, yet it is very ordinary in Scripture-similitudes, to give a thing the Name of that whereunto it is likened; *I am the Rose of Sharon, and the Lilly of the Valleys, Cant.* 2. *I am the living bread, Joh.* 6. *I am the door, Joh.* 10. *I am the true Vine, Joh.* 15. All these saith Christ of himself, but is he therefore turned into a Rose or Lilly, or Bread, or Door, or Vine; no, the words taken literally and properly, are blasphemy; but the meaning is, he is like these, as to the particular cases whereof he speaks.

So the Scripture ordinarily gives to Signs the Names of the things signified, *Genes.* 40. 12. *The three branches are three dayes, v.* 18. *The three baskets are three dayes*; and of such things we have a multitude of Examples. And thus the Holy Ghost gives to Sacramental signs, the names of the things signified by them. Circumcision is cal'd the Covenant, whereof it was a Sign and Seal, *Gen.* 17. 13. the Lamb is cal'd the Passeover, *Exod.* 12. 11. and so in the Text the bread is cal'd Christs body, and the wine his blood, because they are Signs, and a Seal to signifie and convey Christ, with the benefits of his body broken, and of his blood shed for us. And thus I have proved, that this Scripture is not for, but against Transubstantiation, in all the branches of it.

The other Scripture which they alleadge for Transubstantiation, is our Saviours discourse *of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood*, in *Joh.* 6. And *Bellarmine* (*c*) pretends to prove that Doctrine from *v.* 51. of that chapter, almost to the end of the Chapter.

To this I say, that I do readily grant, that the flesh and blood of Christ here spoken of, which include the benefits of his death, is the spiritual matter of the Feast of the Lords Supper; and that Believers are here required to feast their Souls by Faith on the body and blood of Christ, and on all the benefits of his death, in all those wayes which God is pleased to offer it to them: And therefore though the Lords Supper be since instituted, yet they are bound by this Scripture to feed on the body and blood of Christ in that Ordinance, in the appointed use of bread and wine.

a Disparatum de disparato non proprie prædicatur.

b *August. contra Adamant. Manich. lib.* 12. Non dubitant dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui.

c *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 1. *cap.* 5, 6.

wine. But yet this Scripture alſo is fully againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and the corporal preſence of the body and blood of Chriſt, under the Accidents of Bread and Wine, and the Communicants eating and drinking the ſame; and this appears by theſe three Reaſons.

I. Becauſe as I have proved, our Saviour tels us, that his fleſh, *viz.* the corporal eating his fleſh profiteth nothing *ver.* 63.

II. Becauſe the eating the fleſh and drinking the blood of Chriſt here ſpoken of, is of abſolute neceſſity to ſalvation, *v.*53. *Except ye eat the fleſh of the ſon of man, and drink his blood ye have no life in you*, but though none can be happy who do not eat the fleſh and drink the blood of Chriſt in the ſence of this Scripture, yet our adverſaries do not deny, but many have eternal life who never eat and drank the Lords Supper.

III. Becauſe Eternal life is certainly ſetled and entail'd on all thoſe who do eat the fleſh and drink the blood of Chriſt in the ſence of this Scripture, *vir.*54. *Whoſo eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day*; and yet the Papiſts tell us that wicked men may corporally eat the fleſh and drink the blood of Chriſt; ſo that the Popiſh eating the fleſh and drinking the blood of Chriſt, and that eating his fleſh and drinking his blood, which our Saviour here ſpeaks of, are as farre different as heaven and hell.

2. *Argument.* It is impoſſible that this Tranſubſtantiation ſhould be in the Lords Supper, this is evident by the nature of the thing: for who ſo underſtands the nature of this act of Tranſubſtantiation, and the terms thereof, *viz.* the bread and wine, which are the things that are turned, and the body and blood of Chriſt into which this bread and wine are turned, muſt clearly ſee that as hereby the bread and wine muſt be taken away, ſo the body and blood of Chriſt muſt be hereby made and produc'd: and therefore in their *Letany* of the Sacrament they doe invocate it thus; *panis omnipotentiâ Dei caro factus miſerere nobis*: O Bread which by the Almighty power of God art made fleſh have mercy upon us, implying that the fleſh and body of Chriſt is made by this Tranſubſtantiation, and thus by this blaſphemous contradiction they make the ſubſtance of the glorious body of Chriſt, ſo long ſince born of the Virgin, to be the birth of this prodigious monſter of Tranſubſtantiation; now I ſay it is impoſſible to make that which was made before, to do that by an act which was done before the act, its impoſſible for the effect to be before the cauſe, and its impoſſible for bread of a few hours old to be turn'd into the ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt, which was continually of the ſame ſubſtance for above a 1000 years before.

And therefore though theſe blaſphemers ſeem devoutly to adore the Almighty power of God, which by this converſion hath wrought *ſtupendum ſupra omnia miraculum*, the moſt ſtupendious of all miracles, as they invocate it in the ſame Lettany of the Sacrament; yet all in effect that they can ſay is this, that the great God out of his infinite love to his Church hath in this bleſſed ordinance of the Lords Supper by many aſtoniſhing miracles done juſt nothing, and thus they moſt prophanely

phanely abuse the fearfull name of God in ascribing a work to his dreadfull omnipotency, which is beneath the power of his meanest creature, *viz.* to make that which was made before, which indeed cannot be a work of any power at all. I know some learned men of the Church of *Rome* do undertake to decline this impossibility and contradiction, and yet to defend this doctrine of Transubstantiation as defin'd in the Council of Trent, and therefore *Bellarmine* with many of his brethren the Jesuites to avoid the aforesaid impossibility; explaines this action of Transubstantiation thus, that the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ, *non esse productivam sed adductivam*, that it is not such a conversion that produceth the body of Christ, for that was extant before, but it is such a conversion, whereby the body of Christ which was before in heaven, is now (yet without any local motion from heaven) made present under the accidents of bread in the Lords Supper. But whilst their champion by another contradiction (in making the same body of Christ, which is in heaven to be under the accidents of bread on earth, and yet without receiving any new being or moving from heaven to earth) pleads for Transubstantiation, he destroyes both the *name*, and *nature* of it: He destroys *the name* of it, for that conversion, which he speaks of, may be cal'd *a Desubstantiation or destruction* of the bread, and *a translocation, or transposition* of the body of Christ, whereby it is placed where it was not before, but can by no means bear the name of *Transubstantiation*, which (saith the Council of Trent) the Catholick Church doth very fitly and properly give it.

a *Bellarm.* de Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 18.

Again he destroyes the nature of Transubstantiation, for in every substantial conversion, whereby one substance is turned into another, the latter is alwaies produc'd, and receives being upon the destruction of the former, as when *Moses* his rod was turned into a serpent, *Exod.* 4. had God only destroy'd the substance of the rod, and set a Serpent, that was extant before in the place of it, this had not been a turning the rod into a Serpent. So when at the marriage-feast, *John* 2. Christ turn'd water into wine, had God only destroyed the substance of the water, and set wine that was extant before in some wine-sellar, and plac'd it in the water-pots, this had not been a turning water into wine; but the true substance of the serpent, and the true substance of the wine were by those miraculous conversions made and produc'd, and so if the true substance *of the bread and wine* be miraculously turn'd into the substance *of the body and blood of Christ*, as the Council of *Trent* will have it, upon the destruction of the substance of the bread and wine, there must necessarily be produc'd the substance of the body and blood of Christ, as the effect and product of that conversion: and notwithstanding all the noise which our adversaries make in the Christian world, about this matter, they must either assert this monstrous impossibility, and contradiction, or disclaim their own doctrine of Transubstantiation.

3 *Argument.* This doctrine of Transubstantiation destroyes the Lords Supper, my reason is, because this doctrine takes away those sacred signs of

of bread and wine, which God hath appointed to be of abſolute neceſſity to the being of this Sacrament, and if theſe be taken away there is no ſuch thing as the Lords Supper in the world.

Our Adverſaries grant, that its neceſſary to the being of a Sacrament, that there be a ſenſible, and ſacred ſign, and that muſt ſignifie a ſacred and holy thing, and this ſign muſt be of Gods inſtitution.(*a*)

a *Thom. par.* 3. *qu.* 60. *art.* 1. 2. 5.

Now the ſign or ſigns in this Sacrament of the Lords Supper, muſt be one of theſe three things.

1. It muſt be either the body and blood of Chriſt.
2. Or it muſt be the accidents of bread and wine.
3. Or it muſt be true bread and wine.

I. It cannot be the body and blood of Chriſt, for theſe are not ſenſible, and they are the things ſignified, and therefore they cannot be the ſigns.

II. It cannot be the Accidents of bread and wine, though *Bellarmin*, as I have ſhewed, makes theſe to ſignifie the body and blood of Chriſt, and ſo to be eſſential to this Sacrament; but this cannot be, for two Reaſons.

1. Becauſe, as I have proved, the accidents without the ſubſtance are nothing, and ſo can ſignifie nothing, and therefore can be no ſignes.

2. Every Sacramental ſign muſt be (as our adverſaries confeſs) of Gods inſtitution, now God never ordained the accidents *of bread and wine* without the ſubſtance to ſignifie the body and blood of Chriſt; if he did, either they muſt be conſecrated to this uſe by virtue of theſe words, *this is my body, this cup is my blood, &c.* or theſe words muſt declare them to be of this uſe, but our adverſaries dare not ſtand to either of theſe, for then they muſt yield, that the meaning of theſe words is, theſe accidents of bread and wine are ſignes of, or do ſignifie the body and blood of Chriſt, but that by the word *this* is meant theſe accidents, *Bellarmin* as I have ſhewed, denies, and that the word *is*, doth denote is a ſign or doth ſignifie, they will by no means admit, becauſe it doth juſtifie our ſence of that word, as ſpeaking of the bread and wine, and overthrowes all their Diſputations to prove that the word *is*, muſt not be taken in a figurative but proper ſence, and indeed overthrowes their whole Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. So that it's manifeſt, that neither Chriſt's body and blood, nor the Accidents of bread and wine can be the Signs in this Sacrament.

3. It remains therefore, that the true bread and wine, muſt be the only ſacred and appointed Signs of the body and blood of Chriſt in the Lords Supper; and that therefore the Papiſts in deſtroying the bread and wine, do utterly deſtroy this bleſſed Sacrament, and tear off this ſacred Seal from the Covenant of Grace, and rob the Church of God, of the body and blood of Chriſt, and of all the benefits of his Death, as ſignified and conveyed to them by this Ordinance.

4 *Argument.* Thoſe Miracles which the Papiſts affirm to be wrought

by Transubstantiation in the Lords Supper, are all false and feigned. In pursuance of this Argument, I shall

First, Repeat some of those Miracles which are said to be wrought by this Act of Transubstantiation.

Secondly, Prove them to be false and feigned.

(1.) I shall only repeat Four of their pretended Miracles.

1. That the Substance of the bread and wine is turned into the body and blood of Christ, and yet his body and blood were extant above a thousand years before the bread and wine were in being.

2. That the Substance of the bread and wine is destroyed, and the Accidents made to remain without the substance, and yet no sensible difference made between the natural Properties of this blessed bread and wine, and all other bread and wine in the world, wherein the Substance continues with the Accidents.

3. That at the first Administration of this Sacrament, the Body of Christ should be in all its compleat parts, head, arms, limbs, and all his flesh and bones at the Table, and there seen and to be felt, and yet the same body, at the same time in the mouths and stomachs of his Disciples, and they not have the least sence of it.

4. That the same body of Christ should be glorified in Heaven, and at the same time, be in the mouths and stomachs of all the Communicants in the world, and be with those Accidents of bread, wheresoever they are, and no where else, and yet not move from Heaven to Earth, nor from one place of the Earth to another, and still be one and the same body.

(2.) I say, these and all such are feigned and false Miracles, as appears by these six Reasons.

1. Because, Though they are pretended to be the stupendious and miraculous works of the Almighty power of God, yet are they no Miracles at all, but impossibilities and contradictions, as I have proved, and so are nothing, and are not works of so much power as for a Worm to creep, and a Grashopper to leap.

2. Because, No Miracles were ever wrought upon sensible Creatures, but the change made by them was discerned, or at least discernible by the senses of men, for whose sake they were wrought: The Serpent which *Moses* his Rod was turn'd into, the Wine which the Water was turn'd into, and all the Miracles wrought by *Moses* in *Egypt*, with all other such Miracles recorded in Scripture, not one excepted, were perceived by the senses; and so if one sensible Creature be turn'd into another sensible Creature, that which the former is turn'd into must be made sensible, or if a sensible Creature be turn'd into an insensible, that which is so turned must pass out of the reach of the senses, and become insensible. And therefore there is no such Miracle wrought as is here pretended, because here is sensible bread and wine, and the senses of men do

do see, and handle, and taste as plain bread and wine, as there is any in the world.

3. Because God never settled such a Power on any order of men, for every one in that Order, to have in all Ages a constant power to work Miracles, and yet by this Doctrine of Transubstantiation, every Priest doth carry about him a power to work more and greater Miracles than ever were wrought by Christ and his Apostles.

4. Because God never set up any stated Ordinance in the Church for the working of Miracles, nor bound himself upon any mens using any Scripture words, alwayes to work Miracles; and yet the Papists will have God alwayes bound to work Miracles, upon every Priests rightly pronouncing in the Lords Supper these words, *This is my body.*

5. God never gave men a power to work Miracles on the glorified body of Christ: *Moses* had power *to divide the waters of the Red Sea, Exod.* 14. 21. and *Joshua* had once power to say to the Sun and Moon, *Sun stand thou still upon mount Gibeon, and thou Moon in the valley of Ajelon, Josh.* 10. 12. and the Disciples had power *to cast out Divils, Matth.* 10. 8. and Christ tells his Disciples, *Matth.* 17. 20. *If ye have Faith as a grain of Mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence into yonder place, and it shall remove:* but for every dirty Priest to practise such a miraculous power upon the glorified body of Christ, as upon the using of these words, *This is my body,* to call it to be locally and corporally present in all the mouths and stomachs of all the Communicants at the Lords Supper; is such a Popish Dream, as exceeds all the fanatick Enthusiasmes in the world, but can never be reckoned in the number of any true Divine Miracles.

6. All these pretended Miracles are of no use, and to no purpose, as to the ends of this Ordinance; but without them we have the body and blood of Christ, with all the benefits of his Death represented, and communicated to us, and so do attain all the ends of this Sacrament in the appointed use of this blessed bread and wine.

5 *Argument.* The Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, because all the senses of all men in the world do testifie, that bread and wine remain in the Lords Supper after Consecration, and this testimony is true: That all the senses of all men in the world, who are in their senses, and know what bread and wine are, and have them so placed that the senses may perceive them, do testifie that this is bread and wine, is not denyed; but that which is denyed, and I am to prove, is, that this Testimony of the Senses is true, and that I prove by these four Reasons.

1. Because by this testimony a man hath the same evidence, that bread and wine remain in the Lords Supper after consecration, as he hath that there are any visible or sensible Creatures in the world; for if when a man sees, and toucheth, and tasts, and smells bread and wine, and hears the wine poured out, he cannot truely know, and upon his knowledge by his senses, truely say, that what he so sees, and tastes, and toucheth,

and smells, and hears, is bread and wine; he cannot upon his knowledge by his senses truely say, that there is a Sun, or Moon, or Starres, or Men, or Birds, or Beasts, or Trees, or Stones, or Earth, or Water, or any bread and wine in the world; for the senses cannot give him a more full and sure evidence of the being of any of these Creatures, than they do of the being of bread and wine in the Lords Supper.

2. Because, if the testimony of the senses be not true, then all that Religion which is founded on Gods manifesting himself by the Creatures, to the Understandings of men, in the use of their Senses, is not a true Religion, but is quite extinguished out of the world, and so there is no Law of Nature binding men truely to know, and love, and prayse God, as he is manifested in the Creatures; and then it is no sin at all for men to take no notice of the glory of God, which the Heavens, and Earth, and Day, and Night, declare to them, *Psal.* 19. And then the Apostles words are not true, in telling us, *That the eternal Power and Godhead are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made*, *Rom.* 1.20. For if by the use of our senses we cannot know, that these things are true, then we neither can, nor are bound to know and honour, and love the Wisdom, and Power, and Goodness of God in them.

3. If the testimony of the Senses be not true, we have no certainty of the Christian Religion; for we cannot know there is a Bible, or letters, or words in it; or that there is a Church, or any such Society of Believers, or that there are Ministers, or Sermons, or Sacraments in the world, for all these are perceived by our senses.

4. If our Saviours Argument was good, to prove that by his *flesh* and *bones*, perceived by the senses, he was no Spirit, *Luk.* 24. 39. *Behold my hands and my feet, handle me and see.* Then this Argument is also good, behold, handle, taste and smell, and thereby judge if there be not a sensible Substance, and this particular Substance of bread and wine in the Lords Supper.

There are two main Objections which the Papists make against this Argument, which I shall answer, and so proceed.

1 *Object.* Senses do not indeed erre in their testimony of their own Objects; but Accidents only, and not Substances, are the Objects of the Senses, and therefore the testimony of the senses concerning Substances is not to be trusted.

Answ. If so, then we can judge of no Substance in the world by our senses, and we cannot know but we are only in a world of Accidents, *viz.* of Colours, and Smells and Sounds, *&c.* and our understandings cannot perceive by them, that there are any Substances in the world, much less discern betwixt one substance and another, but every man by the use of his senses perceives sensible substances by means of the accidents inherent in them, or else no man can swear in judgement any thing concerning any Man, or Beast, or House, or Lands, or Goods, neither can there be any civil converse among men in the world.

2 *Object.*

2 *Object.* Senſe muſt yield to be corrected and over-ruled by Faith, and Gods Word muſt be believed before our Senſes.

Anſw. 1. This is but a Popiſh trick, to hide the truth of God; for it is not our preſent queſtion, whether we muſt believe God or our Senſes, but whether we muſt believe the words of a company of cheating Papiſts, or believe God ſpeaking to our underſtandings by Scripture, by Reaſon, by the Creatures, and by our Senſes, and by all thoſe things which are witneſſes of his Truth to our Souls.

2. We do in this matter give Faith its due place in our Hearts; for our Underſtandings do here perceive by that uſe of our Senſes, which God hath made them for, that here is Bread and Wine; but that this Bread and Wine are bleſſed to ſignifie, and convey to us the Body and Blood of Chriſt, this we aſſent unto by Faith; and by Faith we *do diſcern the Lords body, and blood*, in the uſe of that Bread and Wine which we diſcern by our Senſes: And thus we own both the Truths of God, *viz.* That there is Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, and that Chriſt crucified is therein preſented to our Souls in the uſe of them, and ſo we give both Faith and Senſe their due place and uſe in us.

3. We believe, that the Truths revealed to our underſtandings by the viſible Creatures, in the uſe of our Senſes, are as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *the Truths of God, Rom.* 1. 25. And that it is a Truth of God, that the Creatures we ſpeak of, are Bread and Wine, becauſe we underſtand by our ſenſes, that they have the nature, and all the Properties of Bread and Wine, and we know that *the God that cannot lie*, cannot ſpeak a Truth to our underſtandings, by the Creatures, and by our Senſes, and then deny and contradict it by his Word to our Faith.

It may now be expected, that I ſhould here give you an account of the Doctrine of the Ancients in this matter, but to this I ſhall only ſay theſe three things.

1. That this is undertaken, and I doubt not, is effectually performed by a Reverend Brother, whoſe work aſſigned him is to prove the *Novelty of Popery*, both in this their great Article of Tranſubſtantiation, and alſo in other Popiſh Doctrines, to whoſe Diſcourſe I refetre you for ſatisfaction herein.

2. That I do profeſs to honour the ancient Fathers in the Church of God, who have in their ſeveral Ages been faithfull witneſſes to this, and other Truths of God reveal'd in the Scriptures; and I do rejoyce in my hopes of being in the ſame bleſſed Body of Chriſt with them: but I have choſen to inſiſt on theſe Arguments, which I hope to defend, knowing that all that the Scripture, Reaſon, and Senſes do ſpeak, God ſpeaketh by them; but I cannot ſay of all that *Juſtin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambroſe, Auſtin, Hierom*, &c. do ſpeak, that God ſpeaketh by them; and if it had hapned, that any of theſe men had contradicted Scripture, Reaſon and Senſe (could their Opinions have been as old as the Devil in Hell) I would ſay with the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 1. 6. *Whatever they were,*

it

it maketh no matter to me, God accepteth no mans Person, for God and his Truth must not be tryed by the Judgements of fallible men.

3. That the same Doctrine which I have delivered, hadrits beginning from Christ, and hath passed from him by the Scriptures, through all true Antiquity, is fully proved by Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Morton*, *Crakenthorp*, *Molin*, and *Albertinus*, and many others, who have said more in this case than I have either time or ability to speak, or than would be fit for this Discourse; and it is as manifest that the Judgement of the ancient Fathers is against Transubstantiation, as it is that there were such persons, and that their writings are extant in the world; insomuch, that had they lived under Popish persecutions, they would have burnt those very men on Earth, and cursed them to Hell, whom they canonize for Saints, and vainly and impiously crave their Intercession in Heaven.

I shall yet answer two Objections, and then conclude with a brief Application.

1 *Object.* The Pope and his Council have determined that Transubstantiation is in the Lords Supper, and we *must* believe them.

a *Chemnitius exam. Concil. Trident.*

b *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 23.*

Answ. Chemnitius (a) hath told them, that it is the Confession of *Scotus*, *Cameracensis* and others, that neither Scripture, nor the Opinion of the Ancients, compell us to believe the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; and *Bellarmine* (b) confesseth, that what *Scotus* saith, is not improbable, *viz. That there is no express place of Scripture compells us to admit Transubstantiation without the declaration of the Church.* And so after all their Disputations and Curses, and blood-shed, and deluding so many Souls; we must believe this Doctrine of Transubstantiation, because the Pope and his Council have said it. But how shall we be infallibly assur'd, that God doth transmit his mind and will to us by the Pope and his Council? or where doth God command us to go to this infallible Oracle the Bishop of *Rome*, either singly, or conjunctly with his Council, to be concluded by him or them, in matters of Faith? But alas! what a dreadfull case is this, that a whole world of precious Souls must have no better a Foundation for their Religion and Salvation than this, *viz.* That we must all believe the Papists, and that we must believe them for this Reason, because they tell us we *must* believe them; but if they will damn their Souls in believing one another, let us labour to save ours by believing the God of Truth, speaking to us by his Word.

2 *Object.* These words, *This is my Body*, &c. are the words of our dying Lord, and to his Disciples, to whom he would not speak darkly in Figures; and they are the words of a Testament, and of a Law; and expressed in intire Propositions, all which require Plainness, and to be spoken properly, and not in dark figures: Do not these seem plausible Objections, and cunningly devis'd to trepan poor Souls into Errour? Why these are *Bellarmines* Objections (c).

c *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 1. cap. 9.*

Answ. 1. They themselves are forced to confess, that the words, *This*

cup

my blood, &c. which are the words of a dying Lord, and to his Disciples, and words of a Testament, and of a Law, and an entire Proposition; are yet spoken in no figurative sence, which overthrowes all their pretended Reasons for a proper or literal sence of the words.

2. Words are not therefore dark, because they are figurative, for figures often do explain, and not darken the sence of words; I confess a Trope, a Figure, a Metonymy, a Synechdoche, &c. are hard words to vulgar ears, but you must know that these are words of Art, which learned men have wisely invented, but they are grounded on the natural way of mens expressing themselves, in their ordinary and familiar language: and therefore even Children, and unlearned men that cannot read, do ordinarily speak, and understand the Language that is spoken in Tropes and Figures, though they know not what Trope or Figure to reduce such expressions unto; for Example, If a man say, drink off this Cup or Glass; or as he looks on the Signs in the Streets, saith, This is a Swan, and this is a Lyon; or saith of Pictures in a Chamber, This is *Alexander*, or *Cæsar*; or saith of a written Parchment wherein he hath signified his Will, in bequeathing his Estate, This is my Will; all this is plain and easie, and familiar language, and yet few understand the Tropes in these Expressions: And so the words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, are plain and intelligible words, though few understand the Names of those Tropes or figures, which they are spoken in.

3. Whereas the Papists pretend to give a proper or literal sence of these words, yet their sence to justifie their Transubstantiation is so full of monstrous and blasphemous contradictions, and so dark, that neither they themselves, nor others understand them: Sometimes the word *this* must signifie *these accidents*; sometimes *this substance* contained under these Accidents: But this substance must neither be the Bread nor Christs Body, but an *individuum vagum*, and though the word *this* applyed to a substance doth alwayes determine and demonstrate the said substance, yet here they make it to signifie such a vagrant, that all the world knowes not where to finde it. And in like manner they rack the word *is*, which must sometimes mean *is* properly and essentially, when it speaks of the Accidents, sometimes *is made*, sometimes *is transubstantiated*, and one (*a*) will have it to denote all these: And thus they torture this plain Scripture, to serve their odious Doctrine of Transubstantiation; and when they have done all, they have nothing but the word of a blasphemous Pope, and factious Council for it.

(*a*) *Cornelius a Lapide, in* 1 Cor. 11.

Uses. Six Inferences.

1 *Inf.* That it is Idolatry in the Papists to worship the consecrated Bread, though they think it is turned into the Body of Christ.

I should here speak to two things.

1. That their worshipping the consecrated Bread, is Idolatry.

2. That

2. That their thinking it to be the Body of Christ, doth not excuse them from Idolatry.

(1.) For the first, I shall briefly speak to three things.

1. Acquaint you with their *Doctrine* herein.

2. Acquaint you with their *Practice*.

3. Prove that their practising this Doctrine is *Idolatry*.

1. Their Doctrine is declared in the Council of *Trent* thus. (*a*) That it is an undoubted Truth, that all Christians ought to give the same Worship to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which they give to God himself, and that if any deny this, let him be accursed.

a *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 13. *cap.* 5. Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, cùm omnes Christi fideles, pro more in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ semper recepto, latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo Sacramento in veneratione adhibeant----

Can. 6. Si quis dixerit in sancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei filium, non esse cultu latriæ etiam externo adorandum, venerandum: neque in processionibus, secundum laudabilem, & universalem Ecclesiæ sanctæ ritum, & consuetudinem, & solenniter circumgestandum, vel non publicè ut adoretur populo proponendum, & ejus adoratores esse Idolatras, *Anathema* sit.

2. They practise this Doctrine, for in their *Roman* Missal, the Priests are taught to lift up the Host, and to worship it themselves, thrice striking their breasts, and saying, *O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the World, have mercy upon us.* And among many instances that may be given of their Idolatrous practice herein, I shall only give you this: "In the year 1666. at *Lyons* in *France*, it was instituted, that a company of devout persons taking "their turns, should perpetually day and night adore "the holy Sacrament, some of them alwayes kneeling before it in a certain Church chosen by them: And in a large place more spacious than "*Lincolns-Inne Fields*, *London*, cal'd *Belle Cour*, the Sacrament was "exposed on a rich and magnifick Altar, (set on a high Scaffold) to be "adored by all the Town together; and there were about threescore "thousand people on their knees together, worshipping it; the most glorious Triumph that ever was seen, (saith a *Jesuite* in his late description "of this City.) And thus do these poor deluded wretches solemnly give that Worship to Wafers which is only due to God himself.

3. That this practice is Idolatry, appears,

First, By all that I have said against Transubstantiation; for seeing the substance of the Bread remains, as I have prov'd, the Papist's worshipping this Bread, must needs be gross Idolatry: For the Council of *Trent* makes Transubstantiation to be the ground and reason of this solemn Adoration. (*b*) And its a known saying of their own *Costerus* to this purpose, That if by Transubstantiation the Bread be not turned into the Body of Christ, their worshipping the Host is the greatest Idolatry in the world.

b *Sess.* 1. *cap.* 4. 5.

Secondly, It is gross Idolatry to give that Worship to a Creature which is only due to God; and yet these men fall down unto, and worship, and call upon this Bread; as all Believers fall down unto, and worship and call upon God: Their practice herein is much like their Idolatry in worshipping their graven Images, mentioned *Isa.* 44. 16. 17. *He burneth part thereof in the fire, with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth*

reſteth the reſt, and it ſatisfied, yea he warmeth himſelf, and ſaith, Aha, I am warm, I have ſeen the fire, and the reſidue thereof he maketh a God, even his graven Image, he falleth down unto it, and worſhippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and ſaith, Deliver me, for thou art my God; in like manner do the Idolatrous Papiſts by this Bread, part thereof they take into their mouths, and grind with their teeth, and eat it, and part of it (as in the caſe of the Rats and Worms eating the conſecrated Bread,) they caſt into the fire and burn it, and part thereof they reſerve for their God, and carry it about, and fall down to it, and worſhip it, and pray to it, as to their Saviour, to ſave them from their ſins.

(2.) I proceed to prove, that the Papiſts thinking this Bread to be the Body of Chriſt, doth not excuſe them from Idolatry: This is evident, for God's Law being ſufficiently reveal'd, mans wilful ignorance thereof cannot extinguiſh the Obligation of it, nor alter the nature of that ſin which is a breach of that Law; the Heathens worſhipping the Sun is Idolatry, though they think it to be God; ſo the Papiſts worſhipping the Wafer is Idolatry, though they think it to be the Body of Chriſt with his Soul and God-head; as to kill the Saints of God, is murder and perſecution, though the enemies may think they do therein God ſervice, *Joh.* 16. 2.

2 *Inference.* Hence ſee under what Characters we are to look upon the Papiſts: We are told what Names ſome of their Flatterers have given to ſome of their Popes. In the Council of *Lateran*, it's ſaid of the Pope: *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to thee*; and *Panormitan* ſaith, *the Pope can do all things that God can do.* The Ambaſſadours of *Sicily* cry'd to one Pope, *Thou that takeſt away the ſins of the World, have mercy upon us*; and ſaith a Biſhop in a prophane quibble of Pope *Leo*, *Behold the Lyon of the Tribe of Judah, we have waited for thee (O moſt bleſſed* Leo) *to be our Saviour.* See *Brightman* on *Revel.* 13. 3. and we know his *Holineſs* is the Name given him by the Papiſts; and the *Romiſh* Church doth arrogate the Name of the only Holy Catholick Church. But if we will give the Papiſts a Name from their Religion and Practice, we muſt give them three characters.

Firſt, They are an *Idolatrous* People, as appears by what I have now ſaid, and as is made known to you by more Arguments from other hands; and therefore we need not envy their Grandeur, and Kingdom upon Earth, ſeeing the Apoſtle aſſures us, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. That no *Idolaters have any Inheritance in the Kingdom of God.*

Secondly, They are a moſt *uncharitable* and cruel people; and though their School-men do ingeniouſly plead, that Charity or Love is the moſt excellent of all Graces, and meaſure the worth of other Graces, and the evil of all ſins by Charity; yet are they a moſt inhumane and barbarous People: and this is not only evident, by all the blood of the Saints, that lies crying at their doors for vengeance, but alſo that they will have all men curſed and damned, who will not in defiance of God, and Scripture,

and Reason, and Sense, say that Bread is no Bread, and who will not believe that the God of Truth doth speak all the hideous contradictions in their Doctrine of Transubstantiation; as if having usurp'd the keyes of Hell and Death, they had decreed that all Believers shall be damned, and that none but Atheists and Infidels shall be saved.

Thirdly, A *perjured* people, in that they impose, and many of them take this Oath. "I *N. N.* do swear, that this conversion, which "the Catholick Church doth call Transubstantiation, is made in the Eu-"charist, without the Belief of which no man can be saved. What horrid Perjury is this, to swear that Bread is no Bread, and Wine is no Wine, and that all the contradictions in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation are true, and that all are damned who do not believe the same.

3 *Inference.* Hence we see, that there is no Communion to be had with the Church of *Rome*; for except we will all renounce our present Christianity, and profess that we are no Members of the Church of God, till we are in union with the Pope, and so proclaim our selves, and all Christians in the world, who are not Papists, to be a generation of dissembling Knaves, and except we first turn Atheists, and believe that God speaks lies and contradictions, we cannot turn Papists.

4 *Inference.* Hence see what a dreadfull slavery it is to be the servants and slaves to the Devil, who engageth his servants to debauch their Consciences, and rack their wits, and to spend their precious time, and parts, and Learning, to spread and defend Nonsence and Lies. *Bellarmine (b)* saith, he spent fifteen years about Controversies in Religion: A fearfull thing, that a man of so great Learning and parts should waste a great part of his Age, and much of it in contradicting God, and the Truth, and himself; but though I will not judge any one that is gone into the Eternal World, yet I would warn all to take heed especially how they venture to sin in print, lest their Books should be speaking for the Devil on Earth, when they themselves are tormented with the Devil in Hell.

b *Epist. Sexto 5.*

5 *Inference.* Be faithfull to the Truths of God, and let them not be held in unrighteousness in your judgements, but let them rule in your Hearts and Lives; if Truth prevail to make you holy, then though Seducers may make Merchandize of your Estates, yet they shall never make Merchandize of your Souls; but if you will not love the Truth, and walk in the Truth, all our Arguments cannot secure you from the Temptations of the Devil and Seducers, nor keep God from being angry with you, and from giving you up to strong delusions to believe lies.

Ult. Bless God for your Religion, that your Religion comes from the Grace of God by his Word, to make you holy here, and happy hereafter, and not from the Devil and Pope, to feed your Lusts, and damn your Souls, and to make you goe ignorantly and quietly to Hell; and

and bleſs God that you have in this Nation the true Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which as I ſaid in the beginning of this Diſcourſe, ſo I ſay again in the Concluſion, is clearly and fully delivered from the mind of Chriſt in theſe words, and which hath been ſealed by the blood of thoſe bleſſed Martyrs in our own Land, who have been ſacrificed to death for the ſervice of your Faith, whoſe Blood was of more value than all the Popes that ever uſurped Supremacy over the Church and Body of Chriſt.

SERMON XXII.

The Right of every Believer to the bleſſed *Cup* in the *Lords Supper.*

Matth. XXVI. 27, 28.

And he took the Cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of it. For this is my Blood of the New *Teſtament, which is ſhed for many, for the Remiſſion of ſins.*

THE declared *Will* of God being the moſt certain and happy *Rule* of mans practice, eſpecially in thoſe Duties which have no Foundation ſave in *Divine Revelation*; it is the greateſt Arrogance and Affront to the *Wiſdom* and *Will* of our Law-giver to contradict him therein: But when our *bleſſed Redeemer* hath in his Inſtitutions plainly conſulted our *Benefit* and *Comfort*, when he hath ſtooped ſo low, to raiſe us up ſo high; to croſs and correct him therein, is the ſtrangeſt *folly* and *ingratitude* that is imaginable.

Yet hereof we have a ſad *Inſtance* in the preſent *Church* of *Rome* in the buſineſs of the *Lords Supper*; where nothing can be more plain than our Saviours *Inſtitution* on the one ſide, nor more palpable than their *Corruption* of it on the other: wherein is evident the lamentable *Degeneracy* of the Humane Nature, together with the power of *Prejudice*, and the miſchief of a wilfull *Obſtinacy*, eſpecially when accompanyed with the worldly Intereſt of *Profit* or *Honour*.

It hath been indeed the more ordinary humour of that *Church*, to invent and *adde* burthenſome ſuperfluities to other of Gods Ordinances, but they whoſe Conſciences will permit them to adde, will eaſily adventure alſo to *diminiſh* when it ſerves their turn; as appears in their denying

to

to Gods people the *one half* of the *Lords Supper*, to wit, the *ſacred Cup*, againſt the ſtream of *Scripture*, and all *Antiquity*.

The vindicating of this bleſſed Ordinance of *God* is my preſent work, and I cannot have a better ground to build upon, than the words of the *holy Evangeliſt* which are before you.

Wherein you may pleaſe to conſider,

1. *The Connexion* [*And*] i. e. having immediately before *taken bread, bleſſed it, and delivered* to his Diſciples, *in like manner* he now takes the *Cup*.

2. *The Narration*, (1) Of what our *Saviour did*. The ordinary Actions of *Princes* are obſerved; with what carefull *Reverence* then ſhould we ponder this *Extraordinary Action* of the *King of Heaven*, eſpecially when he was at Death's door? *Three* things he *did*, 1. *He took the Cup*. 2. *He gave thanks*. 3. *He gave it to them*. It was the *Practice* of the *Jews*, unto which certainly *Our Saviour* had regard herein, at the end of their *Feaſts*, for the Maſter thereof to take *a Cup of Wine*, and after a ſhort *Thanksgiving* to drink a little thereof, and ſo the *Cup* paſſed round the Table, and this they termed, *a Cup of Thanksgiving*. This *Uſe* he was pleaſed to tranſlate and ſanctifie to be *a ſacred Rite* at the Lords Supper to the end of the World: As he did adopt their *waſhing* of their *Proſelytes* in the inſtitution of *Baptiſm*.

P. Fag. in Deut. 8. 10. *ex Rabbin.* כוס הלל

(2) Here is an account of what *Our Saviour ſaid*; when, if ever, his *lips were like Lillies dropping ſweet-ſmelling Myrhe*. Where there is Cant. 5. 13.

Firſt, *A Command*, [*Drink ye all of it*] wherein you have,

1. *The thing commanded*, [*Drink of it*,] that is, (by an uſual figure) of the *Wine* contained in this Cup: or, as *ſome Tranſlations* read [*Drink out of it*.] *Dutch.*

2. *The Perſons intended*, [*ye all*] that is, all ye *my Diſciples* in the firſt place; who upon occaſion of celebrating the *Paſſeover* (they being our *Saviours* ordinary Family) were then alone with him at the *Table*. But foraſmuch as he commanded them to do this in *remembrance of him*, that is, when he was *dead*, and the Apoſtle *Paul* declares, that this Sacramental Action muſt continue *untill he come*, and that by *all that are ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus*, that are able *to examine themſelves*, therefore the [*All*] in the *Text* muſt neither be confined to the *Perſons* of the *Apoſtles*, nor to them that ſucceed them in any particular *Office*, but concludes all that are *adult Diſciples* of *Jeſus Chriſt* to the end of the world. 1 Cor. 1. 2 *with* 1 Cor. 11. 28.

Secondly, *A Reaſon*, or *Argument* to urge the due participation thereof, drawn from the *Sacramental Nature of that Cup*. *For this* (to wit, the Wine contained in this Cup) *is my blood of the New Teſtament*: Or, (as the Evangeliſt *Luke*, *ch.* 22. 20. delivereth it) *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood*, that is, the *New Covenant ſealed with my blood*. For neither the *Cup*, nor the Wine in it, nor the *blood* of Chriſt is properly the New *Covenant* or *Teſtament*; but by this that is contained in this Cup, the

New Covenant which is ſealed and confirmed by the Blood of Chriſt is kept in remembrance. He ſaith in effect, As Covenants uſed to be confirmed by the *ſhedding of blood*, ſo do I by my Blood ſeal to you a *New* † *Covenant*, far *better* than the Old, which demanded perfect Obedience, and denounced the Curſe for defect thereof; but this promiſeth *Remiſſion* of ſins; and a Covenant far *clearer*, than when it was adminiſtred under the *ſhadowes* of the Law, which hereby are *abrogated*. And therefore *drink ye all of this*, that have an *intereſt* in *that Covenant*, and that have need of *this blood*.

† So the word διαθηκη is moſt commonly taken: and ſo moſt properly in this place as the Epithet [*New*] which is adjoyned, evinceth.

And this *Blood* is illuſtrated, (1) By a neceſſary *Adjunct* to it, namely, this Cup doth repreſent my blood [*which is ſhed*;] which cannot be exemplified by eating the blood with the body, but as ſhed out of the veins; for without *ſhedding of blood* there was *no remiſſion*. And this *Our Saviour* expreſſeth in the *preſent* tenſe [*is ſhed*] to aſſure his Diſciples *then*, that it would certainly and ſuddenly be done, and to aſſure all true Believers *now* of the reality of it, though it be paſt, as if it were now in doing.

Heb. 9. 22.

(2) By the *Finis cui*, or the *Perſons for whom* it is ſhed [*for many*] ſo this *Evangeliſt*, and the *next*, that doth epitomize him: To ſhew, 1. That he dyed not for himſelf, but for others; Or perhaps 2. By this reſtrain'd Expreſſion to exclude *Judas*; Or rather, 3. This Blood is not only ſhed for you *Apoſtles*, but for abundance more. Which the *Evangeliſt Luke*, and *Paul* after him, expreſs in other terms, and ſay, *my blood ſhed* [*for you*] that *each* of them might apply it to themſelves. So that all Believers for whom this precious Blood was ſhed, have an undoubted Right to drink of it.

Maldonat. in loc.

(3) By the *Finis cujus*, or the *End for which* this Blood is ſhed, and that is expreſſely [*for the remiſſion of Sins*] This *Lamb of God* came, and lived and died to *take away the ſins of the World*. For though Sin was *ſatisfied* for by *Jeſus Chriſt*, and ſo we are ſaid to be *redeemed*; yet becauſe no ſatisfaction was made *by us*, therefore we are ſaid to be *remitted*. So then whoſoever can triumph in the benefit of Remiſſion of Sins, hath a juſt right to drink of this Cup, which ſeals the *New covenant*, and the *forgiveneſs of ſins*.

From theſe words thus explain'd I lay down this *Aſſertion* or *Doctrine*:

Doct. *That every adult Believer hath an undenyable Right to the Bleſſed Cup in the Lords Supper.*

In the handling of which *Truth*, I ſhall briefly,

1. *State the Queſtion.*
2. *Prove the Poſition.*
3. *Refute the Objections.*
4. *Make Application.*

For

For the right *stating of the Question* you may observe, I.

1. That our business is not, to debate, *Whether a man may or may not receive Christ, and all his benefits under one Element in the Lords Supper*; for we acknowledge, that this may be done by the Spirit of God working Faith in the heart, as *with*, so *without* either of them.

2. We undertake not to prove, that *To partake of both Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper is absolutely necessary, and that to salvation.* We affirm, that the *spiritual* eating of *Christs body* and *blood* is absolutely necessary; but there is not the same necessity of feeding upon them *Sacramentally*; and accordingly, that it is the *wilfull neglect*, not the *inevitable defect* thereof, that is damnable. The Divine *command* doth indeed impose a Necessity of Observance in all cases, where his *Providence* doth not supersede the same; and therefore they that unwillingly are depriv'd of this *intire* Ordinance may escape *Hell*, but they that willingly neglect it, cannot escape *guilt*. We onely conclude, that there is the *same* necessity of communicating in the *one* Element, as in the *other*.

3. Our asserting the Believers Right to the Sacred Cup, doth *not urge an Obligation upon such as are naturally or irremediably disabled from participation thereof.* If in an *Infant* there be an incapacity to *discern the Lords Body*; If there be an incurable *Antipathy* to the taste of Wine; If after receiving that sacred Bread, *Death* come between the Cup and the Lip, or the like; as our Doctrine obligeth not to *Impossibilities*, so all Laws that do intend a *general Obligation*, yet do admit of some extraordinary and particulars *exceptions*, especially when the Law-giver himself (as in such case he doth) creates the hindrances. Thus many have a rightfull *Interest* (*Jus ad rem*) in things, whereof they never have (*Jus in re*) the rightfull *Possession*. *Jura constituenda esse in iis quæ ὡς τὸ πολὺ accidunt, non quæ ἐκ παραλόγου ex inopinato nec in singulas personas sed generaliter constituit.* Reg. Jurisconsult.

4. Our Doctrine is, That *both parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Christs Ordinance and Commandment ought to be ministred to all Christian men alike.* That *Christs Ministers ought to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and to give both to the Communicants.* That *Believers do receive what is given to them by the Lords Minister, and do eat the bread of the Lord, and drink the Cup of the Lord*; That *Both parts of the Sacrament are given to the Laity in the Lords Supper, because the Sacrament was instituted, not onely for some part of the Church, to wit, the Priests.* *Artic.* 30. *Confess. Angl.* cap. 29. *Confess. Helvet.* c. 21. *August. Confess.* So the *Saxon*, *&c.*

5. We affirm, That *no man can justly infringe this Right, or deny to adult Believers this blessed Cup.* That *the Cup of the Lord is not to be denyed to the Lay-people.* That *the denyal of the Cup to the People is contrary to the Institution of Christ.* That *they are disallowed that withhold the One kind, to wit, the cup of the Lord from the faithfull*; yea, *they sin grievously against the Lords Institution, which saith, Drink ye all of it, which he did not say so expressely of the Bread.* That *no humane Authority ought to forbid the Appointment of Christ, and the most received custom of the ancient Church.* *Artic* 30. *Confess. Angl.* c. 29. *Confess. Helvet.* c. 21. *Confess. August.*

One

One would wonder, how ſo *clear* an *Inſtitution* ſhould ever come in to queſtion; ſome few *Superſtitious* perſons, and ſome *Hereticks* did long agoe chooſe to communicate in one kind, but they were ſtill corrected by Orthodox *Councels*. And afterwards, out of fear of ſhedding the blood of Chriſt, there were *ſome* that being loth to loſe either Element, did uſe to dip the conſecrated Bread in the Wine; and this ſome *Councels* did allow to perſons that were infirm. But it was about *fourteen hundred* years after the Inſtitution, before ever any publick contradiction was made thereunto. And then the Councel of *Conſtance*, then that of *Baſil*, and laſtly that of *Trent*, forbad the uſe of the *Cup*, not onely to the People, but to the *Prieſts* alſo; except to him onely that for the time officiates. They at *Conſtance* ſay, *Though Chriſt did adminiſter this venerable Sacrament to his Diſciples under both the kinds of* Bread *and* Wine, *yet notwithſtanding this, the cuſtom of communicating under one kind only is now to be taken for a Law.* Again, *Though in the Primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithfull under both kinds; yet notwithſtanding this, the cuſtom that is introduced of communicating under one kind onely for the Laity, is now to be taken for a Law.* They at *Baſil* not many years after being warned by a *Learned* man, who was imployed to put a better face on ſo foul a matter, left out thoſe ſtrange and preſumptuous *Notwithſtandings*, and thus made their Canons or *Decrees*, That *the Laity, as alſo the Clergy who do not conſecrate, are not bound by the Lords command to receive both kinds.* Again, *The Church hath power to order how the Sacrament ſhall be miniſtred; and, ſo that people do communicate according to the appointment of the Church, whether under one or both kinds, it is ſufficient for the Salvation of the worthy Receiver.* Then come they at *Trent*, and notwithſtanding all the inſtances of *Chriſtian Princes*, and the Arguments of *great Divines* there to the contrary, They *declare*, That *the Laity and Clergy that do not conſecrate are bound by no divine Precept to receive the Euchariſt under both kinds*; and do *Accurſe all thoſe that affirm the contrary.* Again they declare, That *though at the beginning of Chriſtianity both kinds were frequently received, yet that cuſtom (for good Reaſons) being altered, the Church now approves of Communion in one kind, which cuſtom no man can lawfully change, without the Authority of the Church*; and do *Accurſe all ſuch as do affirm, that they do erre herein.* And this is the true ſtate of this matter, and thus we fall at Variance.

Comperimus quòd quidam ſumptâ tantummodo corporis ſacri portione à calice ſ cratſeruoris abſtinent, qui proculdubio, quiniam neſcio qua *ſuperſtitione* docentur aſtringi, aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia diviſio unius ejuſdemq; myſterii ſine grandi ſacrilegio provenire non poteſt. *Gelaſ. pap. diſt. 2. de Conſecr. An.* 492.

Concil. Turanenſ.
An. 1414.
An. 1431.
An. 1545.
Seſſ. 13.

Jo. Gerſon.
Seſſ. 30.

Seſſ. 21.

II. And now you you ſhall ſee the *Proof* of our *Doctrine* and *Poſition*, which is the *Second* thing incumbent on me, and that will be ſufficiently done by theſe *Arguments*.

Arg. 1. *From the Inſtitution of this Sacrament, and our Saviours Command annexed thereunto.* For Sacraments depend meerly upon their Inſtitution;

Inſtitution; hence doth their Being reſult, and upon this their matter and ſignification do depend. *The Inſtitution with the Element makes the Sacrament*, and ſo the only Rule and Balance for them muſt needs be their Inſtitution. This being the Ground of this Ordinance, no *Man or Angel* may violate under a fearfull Curſe. And indeed, if mens will or wiſdom might alter and change the Revelation of God, nothing would abide firm in Religion. 'Tis true, the Laws of Men may be corrected or annulled, becauſe they foreſee not their Inconveniences; but *Our Saviour* (certainly) when he appointed this Ordinance, well knew what was neceſſary and uſefull for his Church to the end of the World. And for this Reaſon the *Apoſtle Paul*, when ſome diſorders were broken into the Church of *Corinth* in the uſe of the *Lords Supper*, he recalls them to the *Inſtitution*, and endeavours by that ſtraight Rule to rectifie their Irregularities, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. *For I have received of the Lord*, &c. By which place it is evident, that there is no ſuch way to obviate any miſtake which in after-times creeps upon Gods own Ordinance, as by going back to the Spring, by conſidering the Inſtitution: Inſomuch as the *ſame Apoſtle* for their violating *Chriſts* Inſtitution in their *adminiſtration* of this Ordinance, ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. *This is not to eat the Lords Supper.*

Vid. *Cyrian* ep. 63. ad *Cacil.*

Gal. 1. 8.

Indignum eſt Domino, qui aliter myſterium celebrat, quàm ab eo traditum eſt. Non enim poteſt devotus eſſe qui aliter præſumit, quam datum eſt ab Authore. *Ambroſ.* in 1 *Cor.* 11.

Now you may plainly ſee *Our Saviours Inſtitution* in this *Text*, *Mat.* 26. 27. *And he took the Cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, ſaying*, &c. And in *Luk.* 22. 20. the *Evangeliſt* comes with a *likewiſe*. *Likewiſe alſo the cup after Supper*, &c. that is, As he gave the Bread, *in like manner* he gave the Cup. They have an equal ground in their firſt Inſtitution; and ſo ought to be given to, and received by the Faithful, the one as well as the other. *What Chriſt hath joyned together, no man ought to put aſunder.*

I ſhall give the ſubſtance of the *Oppoſition* which is made to this Branch of this Argument. To the *Antecedent*, *One* ſaith, *That Chriſt did inſtitute many things in the Church, but not with a deſign to oblige every man to the uſe of them; it being ſufficient, that ſome in the Church do one thing, and ſome another. That God in inſtituting of Marriage, did not intend to oblige every one to marry.*

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25. *Eſtius* in l. 4 diſt. 11. ſ. 8.

To this I *anſwer*, That the Deſign of our Saviour is beſt known by the *command* which did accompany the Inſtitution, which is, *Drink ye all of it*; and by the *Uſe* the Cup was expreſſely deſigned unto in the Sacrament, which was to *keep in remembrance his Death*, and his *bloodſhedding* therein; both which relating to *all* Believers alike, do make it plain, that the intent of the Inſtitution was to oblige all Believers.

Others do ſay, *That though Chriſt did inſtitute this Sacrament in both kinds, yet the Church hath power to alter his Inſtitution; alleadging, that the like was done in the caſe of* Baptiſme, *which being appointed to be adminiſtred in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, was afterwards done onely in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, Act. 19. 5.

Roſſerſ in refut. art. 16. *Luiberi.*

To which I *anſwer*, That the *Holy Ghoſt* doth not in the place ſpeci-

fied, describe the manner *how* Baptism was celebrated, but sheweth that they there were baptized in the Name (that is, according to the Doctrine and Appointment) of the Lord Jesus. It no more intends, that they were baptized *onely* in *Christs* Name, than St. *Pauls* stiling himself the Servant of *Jesus Christ*, excludes the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*. And thus it is understood not onely by the *Ancients*, but by divers of the *learnedst* of the *Roman* Church themselves.

Photius Bibl. p. 1603. *ex Eulog.* *Estius* in l. 4. d. 3. s. 4. *Fabr. Paulut.* in Act. 19. *D. Soto* in tertiam dist. 4. art. 6.

To make sure the *consequent*, That *our Saviour* did institute this Sacrament in both kinds for all Believers, I adde hereunto the *command of our Saviour* at the Institution of it, *Matt.* 26. 27. *Drink ye all of it.* 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. *This do ye as oft as ye drink it.* The Institution is *Dogmatical*, layes down the Law; but this is *preceptive*, and charges the Execution of it. Which Command could not be terminated in those present Apostles, but extendeth to all Believers to the End of the World; for so saith the Apostle, *by so doing, ye do shew the Lords death till he come.* And without doubt, if one of the Elements be sequestred from Believers, then must by the same reason the other also; for the *Apostle* saith, *After the same manner also he took the cup, and delivered it*, and commanded the same use of it, just as he had done before of the Bread.

I shall not stand upon that *Observation* of the express mentioning of [*All*] when the Cup was given; the like not added when the Bread was delivered: as if *our Saviour* had on set purpose added that word, to confute the Sacriledge which he foresaw would be committed about it. It is sufficient, that here is a plain Command to all that had eaten the Bread, to drink *in like manner of the Cup.* And if this do not indispensibly oblige both the *Apostles* there present, and also all Believers after them till *Christ* come again; there is no ground for the administring of either Element to any whomsoever at this day, which is directly contrary to the *Apostles Inference* from hence, and to all mens sentiment, that have not quit both their *Religion* and *Reason*.

1 Cor. 11.

Jac. a S. Maria, ser. 7. de sulen. corp. Christi.

And yet behold what Subterfuges they that would be mad with Reason have found out to avoid our Lords Command. *First*, they say, *This onely, imports a liberty given hereby, such as that, Increase and multiply, which layes no Obligation upon every one to marry for the increase of the World.* Or as *others*, *This is onely an Invitation, such as that, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, but no command.*

Suarez. Disp. 74. de Sacr.

Which Comments do not onely deprive the People of the blessed Cup, but do release both Ministers and People from both Elements; for (the Fate of both being just the same) where there is no Command, or Law, there is no transgression. And were it but an *invitation*, yet as they manage it, it is not very civil: For the Priest saith, *Drink ye all of it*, and when he hath so said, he drinks it all himself. If it be said, *That all others did drink in and by the Apostles; and now do drink in and by the Priest:* It must needs follow, that in their eating, all others do eat, and then there is no need of either.

Obj.

Obj. 2. They say, *That this command did onely concern them that were present, or at furthest, that it onely concluded with the Apostles their Successors.* Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 25.

Anſ. A poor Refuge. For then [*take, eat*] onely concerned them also; and so they give the other Element to the people without any warrant. And so also will they exclude even their Priests themselves that do not administer, from the Cup; whereas for all that, they pretend to be Successors to the Apostles; for the Apostles at that time did not admini ter, and so did rather represent the People, or Non-officiating Ministers, than any else. But we affirm, whoever succeeds the *Apostles* in their *Faith*, though they succeed them not in their *Office*, have a Right to the blood of Christ in the Sacrament; forasmuch as they all have a right in the New Covenant or Testament, whereof that Cup is a Seal, and are all commanded to drink it in Remembrance of his Death, till he come.

Obj. 3. They say, *That this is an Affirmative Precept, and therefore binds not alwayes, but when there is a necessity; but in the Church of* Rome *there is no such necessity, for there they are all content without it.* Cajetan in tertiam Tho. q. 80. art. 12.

Anſ. But to this we *answer*. The Command for consecrating the bread and wine is also affirmative, which yet to omit, they hold a crime; so also is the Precept of receiving the Bread affirmative; yet by this Rule there would lie no Obligation from the Precept on any, in either of these cases. Affirmative Commands do alwayes binde, though not to the performance of them at all times: and it were a strange way to evade them by making a *Law on Earth*, that none should desire to fulfill the *Laws of Heaven*.

Obj. 4. They alleadge, *That our Saviour said not at the giving of the cup, Do this; nor the Apostle* Paul, *But as oft as ye drink it*; that is, *when ye do drink it, do it in remembrance of me: and this they triumph in, as a wonderfull Providence of God in so describing it.* Estius l. 4. dist. 11. s. 7. Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25.

Anſ. But the *answer* is easie. 1. This word (*as oft as*) is also applyed to the Bread, as well, and in the same manner as to the Cup; *As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup.* 2. The Command of *Doing this* is clearly implyed in saying [as oft as ye do it]: for he that commands to do it *worthily*, doth imply a Command to *do it*. And, 3. If *Do this* were not included in (*as oft as ye do it*) there would be no ground to administer the Cup to any Person at all in the Church.

It remains then, that by vertue of our Saviours *Institution* a *Right* accrues, and by vertue of his *Command* an *Obligation* lies upon Believers to partake of the blessed Cup in the Lords Supper.

Arg. 2. The *second Argument* is taken from the *Example* and *Appointment* of the Apostles. Their *Example* is plain, *Mark* 14. 23. *And they all drank of it.* Though the Blood of Christ was yet in his Body, yet they plainly followed the Institution, and stood not upon the Notion

of *concomitance*. And leſt any ſhould ſay, that their drinking of that Cup gives no Right or Ground for us to do the like, I adde conjunctly therewith, the *direction* and *appointment* of the great Apoſtle of the Gentiles, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. *This do ye as oft as ye drink it*, &c. where drinking of the Cup is joyn'd with eating the Bread *five* or *ſix* times in *five* Verſes together.

And this Order is conſiderable, if we mark 1. *From what hand* the Apoſtle *received* it, which you may ſee *Verſ.* 23. *For I have received of the Lord, that which alſo I have delivered unto you.* Could he have had it from a better and ſurer hand? This he received of the *Lord*, let others conſider of whom they have received the contrary: yea, this came from the *Lord Jeſus* when he was in *Heaven*; they that bring another Doctrine, ſurely had it delivered from *Hell*. 2. Mark *unto whom this Order is directed*; and theſe were, the *Body* of the Church of *Corinth*, not the *Miniſters* onely: yea and not onely to that Church, but to *all that in every place call upon the Name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord*, as you may ſee 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. And though every thing in that Epiſtle was not intended for every one, yet this muſt needs be intended to regulate all thoſe that were guilty of that diſorder, or in danger to be corrupted by it; and thoſe were the ordinary Members of that Church, and others after them. And *He* was no Novice that thus argues from the 28th *Verſ.* He that is bound to *examine himſelf*, is bound alſo to drink of that Cup; but not the Miniſters onely, but the People are bound to examine themſelves; they therefore are bound to drink of it. And, 3. Mark, *to what End the Inſtitution is here deſcribed* and *urged*, which though it was not to prove *this point* in queſtion, yet it was to regulate another diſorder, which was grown among the *Corinthians*; and this he doth by reducing them to the *firſt Standard*; and therefore cannot be imagined to be either *defective* or *ſuperfluous* in his Deſcription. It is but weakly ſaid, that the *Apoſtle* did not *command* this Practice, but *delivered* it; whereas he *delivered* the *command* of our *Saviour Chriſt*, and that is enough.

Rivet Cathol. Orth. p. 119.

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25.

I find but two *Objections* worth the naming againſt this *Argument*.

Obj. 1. That *the Apoſtle doth leave the Cup in ſome indifference, for-aſmuch as he ſaith once*, verſ. 17. *Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread* [*or*] (for ſo it is in the *Greek*) *drink this cup of the Lord unworthily*.

Eſtius in l. 4. d. 11. ſ. 7.

Anſ. But it is moſt evident that this (*or*) is uſed here in a *copulative* ſenee; onely that word was fitter here, not to *untie* the two Elements, which the *Apoſtle* had bound together by ſo many Copulatives in the *Text*, but to ſhew that an *equal* care and reverence ſhould be ſhewed in both. It is as if he had ſaid, If a man do *either eat the Bread* or *drink the Cup unworthily*, he is guilty. And of this genuine acception a multitude of Inſtances may be given in the *Scripture*.

Matth. 18. 8. &c.

Obj. 2. Others do *grant, that it was the cuſtom at* Corinth, *to celebrate this Sacrament in both kinds*, but they ſay, *that this preſcribes not to others; for that the Church may abrogate ſuch a cuſtom upon*

Salmero tom. 9. tract. 34.

ſuffi-

sufficient Reasons, her Power being not inferiour to the Apostles.

Ans. But to this we say, That this was the *Rule* that St. *Paul* received from *Jesus Christ*, and which he left for the Direction of the Church of God *untill Christ shall come*. And this was then the *Practice* of the *Universal Church*: and themselves grant, that no man can dispense 1. In the *Lawes of Nature*, nor 2. In *Articles of Faith*, nor 3. In the *Sacraments of the New Testament*. *Aquin.* Quodl. 4. art. 13. *Salmero* ubi supra.

It remains then, that according to the *Example* and *appointment* of the *Apostles*, who were guided by the *holy Ghost* himself, the Sacred Cup was as plainly intended for all Christian men as the holy Bread.

Arg. 3. The *Third Argument* is taken from the *proper End of this Ordinance of the Lords Supper*; which is to keep up *the remembrance*, or to *shew the Lords Death till he come*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26. They who are bound to the End, are also bound to the Means. Every adult Believer is bound to shew the Lords death, which is the *End*; therefore every adult Believer is bound to partake of the Cup in the Lords Supper, which is the *Means* to that End. For so the *Apostle* saith expressely, *vers.* 25. *This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*, and *vers.* 26. *as oft as ye—— drink this Cup, ye doe shew the Lords Death till he come.*

Now although *our Saviours* choice of this Means for this End, be sufficient to evince the *Necessity* and *Fitness* thereof, where it may be had; yet *ex abundanti* it is easie to shew the same from the thing it self. For the Death of our Redeemer coming with the pouring out of his Blood, how can that Death be shewed sufficiently without drinking that Cup poured out in the Sacrament? For the breaking of the Bread doth in no wise represent the effusion of the Blood; that must be done by communicating in the Cup.

I finde but *two Pleas* entred against this *Argument*, and they are these.

Obj. 1. They say, *That* [Do this] *referres not to the Peoples drinking of the Cup, but to the Ministers consecrating it, whereby Christs Death is sufficiently shewed.* Or as others, *These words did consecrate them to be Priests, and so enable to celebrate this Ordinance.* *Cajetan.* ubi sup. 2. *Al. Pigh. contr. Rasib.* 7. *Conc. Trid.* Sess. 22. c. 1.

Ans. That the words [*Do this*] are a sufficient ground for the Ministers consecrating and distributing both the Elements, is very true; but that hereby they were constituted in that Office, is wholly groundless. This being *another business* Our *Saviour* was now about, and there being more plain and formal passages otherwhere in the *New Testament* for that purpose. And then, as to the other conceit, that this onely obligeth the Minister to consecrate both Elements; it neither stands with *reason* nor *construction* of *speech*, to make that Interpretation of it. Not with *Reason* of the thing; for how shall the People who are here directed, shew the Lords death by the Priests consecrating the Cup? Not with good *construction*; for the blessing and delivering being mentioned Matth. 26. 19. Joh. 20. 21, 22, 23.

or

or ſuppoſed before, [*Do this*] muſt needs referre to both; or if but to the one, rather to the latter, than the former. And if the Miniſter muſt deliver both, the People then are bound to receive them.

Eſtius in l. 4. d. 11. ſ. 8.

Obj. 2. They ſay again, *That either of the Elements are ſufficient to commemorate the Death of Chriſt; inaſmuch as it is ſaid of either of them apart, ye do hereby ſhew the Lords death.*

Anſ. It is eaſily granted, that we may commemorate the Death of Chriſt by either of them, yea without either of them: but we urge, that they were both inſtituted to this end, and therefore that it cannot be ſufficiently ſhewed by one of them. He that ſaith *meat* is deſigned for the maintaining of life, denyes not *drink* alſo to be requiſite to the ſame end: Yea though we ſhould grant, that the blood might be received in the Bread; yet by ſuch receiving, the *Death* of Chriſt by the effuſion of his blood for us, could in no wiſe be ſhewed forth: which being the *principal End* of the Sacrament, it is the Peoples Duty as well as the Miniſters to do it, and that till our Saviour come again.

Arg. 4. The *Fourth Argument* is taken from *the Peoples Right in the Thing ſignified by the ſacred cup in the Lords Supper.* And this is us'd by our *Saviour* himſelf, *Mat.* 26. 27, 28. *Drink ye all of this* [For] *this is my blood*, &c. So that look what *benefit* a man would be robbed of, in being deprived of Chriſts blood; that *comfort* he is robbed of, that is deprived of this Cup. And that a Right to the thing *ſignified*, creates a Right to the *Sign*, is ſo great a Truth, that the Apoſtle *Peter* grounds his Practice upon it, where there was no expreſs Rule. *Can any man forbid water to theſe that have received the Holy Ghoſt*, &c. It is true, where there lies a preſent incapacity to receive the outward Ordinance, for want of a requiſite Condition that is annexed thereunto (as there is in Infants, and ſuch like, that cannot yet diſcern the Lords Body, nor examine themſelves,) in that caſe, their Right is ſuſpended: but no *mortal man* can lawfully forbid to thoſe that have an intereſt in that which the Cup ſignifies, the liberty of Drinking of it.

Cui ſignatum ei ſignum.

Act. 10. 47.

Now what is ſignified and exhibited by the Sacred Cup? the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the blood of Chriſt?* And every Believer, that hath a right to the *Body* of Chriſt, hath alſo a right to the *Blood* of Chriſt: They that have Union with Chriſt by Faith, have a clear right to the Communion of his Blood. Again, in the Inſtitution, *Luk.* 22. 20. *This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you.* For whom the Blood is *ſhed*, to them the Cup muſt be *given*; and the rather, in that it was appointed to aſſure a poor Believer thereof; who may ſay, Doth the Covenant of Grace belong to me? was his blood ſhed for ſuch a poor ſinner as I am? Now *Jeſus Chriſt* comes in this Ordinance to ſeal and apply to every particular Soul the general Promiſe and Mercy; and in effect ſaith, *Behold ſinner, this Blood was ſhed for thee, for the remiſſion of thy ſin.*

Si quotieſcunque effunditur ſanguis Chriſti, in remiſſionem peccatorum effunditur, debeo illum ſemper ſumere, ut ſemper peccata mihi demittantur *Gratian de Conſecr. diſt.* 2.

There

There are but *two*, and they very weak *Objections* found against this *Argument*.

Obj. 1. They say, *That Abstemious persons that can drink no Wine, that Infants within the Church, yea that all men have a title to Christs blood, in that he shed it for all men; and yet these may not partake of the Cup in the Lords Supper.* Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25.

Ans. This *Objection* was prevented before, by observing, that in the cases of Infants and abstemious Persons, *God* himself hath by his Providence at present hindred them from participation hereof, and that by a natural incapacity: And for any others out of the Church, as they can pretend no right to his *Blood*, till they acknowledge his *Person*, so they cannot discern the Lords Body or Blood, or examine themselves.

Obj. 2. They tell us, *That they who have the thing signified, need not to strive so much about the sign; he that hath the Money promised by the Bond, is not solicitous at all for the Bond.* Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 27.

Ans. This inded is the ready way to cast off all Sacraments and Ordinances at once; but our Saviour, that knew our weakness of Faith and Love, did institute both these external Elements to strengthen and comfort us. We are made partakers of Christ by *Baptisme*, by the *Word*, by *Faith*; but infinite Wisdom and Love did concurre to appoint this method for the Churches good; and who are we to correct our Blessed *Saviour*, or to intimate that his Institutions are needless?

Seeing therefore that to all true Believers doth belong the thing signified by the Cup in the Sacrament, and that by Gods Ordinance; no man can or ought to forbid them the Sign or Seal thereof.

I might easily multiply *Arguments*, from the *sacred Nature of Testaments*, especially of this *New Testament*, which was sealed with the Blood of the *Testator*. *For though it be but a mans Covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto, Gal.* 3. 15. that is, no man can do it without the greatest injury and sacriledge: how much greater is the injury, that is offered to our *Saviour*, who said, *This is the Cup of the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you*; and who did bequeath both the *sign* and the *thing signified*?

As also from the unwarrantable *Mutilation*, that they who withhold the Cup, do make in the Sacrament. For it is not an *intire* Sacrament, when one *integral* part is wanting; no more than a man is a perfect man, when one Arm or Eye is defective; Nature alwayes ordaining those parts to be double, though both serving to the same use; and implying thereby, that their Operation is more compleat in both, than it can be in one onely: And with the like Wisdom (no doubt) our *Blessed Redeemer* appointed these *two* Elements of Bread and Wine for the intire refreshment of the Soul. But especially when one *Essential* part (as the Cup is, being part of the matter) is taken away, one may truely say, *This is not to eat the Lords Supper*. And besides, nothing is more plain than Christs intention to appoint a *refection* to the Soul *like that of the Body*: all men know

know, that this is by *drink* as well as by *meat*; the one whereof quenches thirſt, and the other repells hunger, and therefore both theſe muſt be uſed to ſignifie a perfect Feaſt or refreſhment, ſuch as *our Saviour* provides for his People.

I had alſo thought to have ſpread before you the univerſal and uncontrouled *Practice* of the Church of God from the *Apoſtles* time for 1300 years and more downwards, for the uſe of the bleſſed Cup by all true Believers in the Lords Supper; And not onely of their *uſe* thereof, but of their *arguments* for its uſe. At leaſt I intended to have produced *one* undoubted *Teſtimony* in each *Century* of years to have witneſſed hereunto; but onely, that this would ſwell this Diſcourſe beyond the preſcribed limits, and that it is done already by many learned men. Thus much ſhall ſuffice for the ſecond Thing, to wit, the proof of our *Doctrine* or *Poſition*.

Chemnit. Chamier. de Euchar. l. 8. c. 9.

Before I come to anſwer the *Objections* made againſt this *Doctrine*, I ſhould have ſet before you the *Confeſſions* of the Adverſe Party; where *very many learned men* do acknowledge, both the firſt Inſtitution and primitive Practice to be in both Kinds; but having heard already the verdict brought in for us herein by *one* of their own *Councels*, I ſhall onely adde the *Obſervation* of a moſt *ſober* and *learned Perſon*, that lived and died in the Communion of the *Church of Rome*, who writes to this purpoſe. "Concerning the Adminiſtra-

Aquin. in 1 Cor. 11. *Eſtius* in l. 4. d. 11. ſ. 7. *Tolet.* in Joh. 6. annot. 27. *Olim permulta ſecula apud omnes Catholicos uſitatum eſſe, ex multorum ſanctorum Scripturis didiſcimus.* Alph. à Caſtr. adv. Hæreſ. ult. de Euchar.

Caſſard. Conſult. Artic. 22. "tion of the Holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, it is ſufficiently known, "that the *Univerſal Church* hath to this day, and the *Weſtern* or *Ro-*"*man* Church for above a thouſand years after *Chriſt* (eſpecially in their "ſolemn and ordinary diſpenſing of this Sacrament) given both Bread "and Wine to all the Members of Chriſts Church, a thing that is mani-"feſt by innumerable teſtimonies both of the *Greek* and *Latine* Anci-"ents. And they were induced ſo to doe, *firſt* by the Inſtitution and "Example of *Chriſt*, who gave this Sacrament of his Body and Blood "to his Diſciples, then repreſenting the Perſons of Believers, *&c.* And after, "Wherefore it is not without cauſe, that the beſt and moſt learned "Catholicks do moſt earneſtly deſire and contend, that they may receive "the Sacrament of Chriſts Blood together with his Body, according to "the ancient Cuſtom continued in the Univerſal Church for many "Ages.

Behold here an acknowledgement ſo plain and full, that I wonder with what countenance men can reſiſt ſo manifeſt a Truth, and *withhold it in unrighteouſneſs*. And yet here they muſter up the beſt ſtrength they have, and will not yield an inch of what they have once eſtabliſhed, be it right or wrong. We ſhall reduce their *Objections* that are either alleadged in their *Councels*, or produced by their *Writers* to theſe *Four heads*, which

III. is the next thing to be done.

1. *Pre-*

1. *Pretence of Scripture.*
2. *Pretence of Reason.*
3. *Pretence of Reverence.*
4. *Pretence of Authority.*

The *Scriptures* which they produce for Communion under *one kind*, are such as these. Object. 1.

(1) *The Types and Figures of the Eucharist in the Old Testament, signifie eating under one Kind; As the Tree of Life in Paradise, The Paschal Lamb; The Manna; The Shew-bread; The Sacrifices, where the flesh was to be eaten, but the blood was not drunk.* Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 24.

Ans. The weakness of this *Objection* would be obvious, if it were put into an *Argument*; but it is not worth that trouble. It is sufficient to answer, 1. That none of these were Types or Figures of the Lords Supper, and so their whole force is lost in reference unto that. For Types are shadowes to represent the substance, but it is uncouth Divinity, to make one Figure the Type of another. And *our Saviour* is plainly cal'd the *Paschal Lamb*, and calls himself the *Mannah* that came down from Heaven, *&c.*

And, 2. If there were some Types that onely intimated *eating*, yet there were others that doe imply *drinking* also. Was there a *tree of Life* in Paradise? so are there *Rivers* of Paradise. Was there *Bread* from Heaven? so were there *Waters* flowing from the *Rock*. And divers of the *Fathers* will produce a clearer figure of both, than any of these, and that was of *Melchizedek*, who brought forth *both Bread and Wine* to feast faithful *Abraham*. And the *Apostle* tells us; *As they did all eat the same spiritual meat, so they all drank the same spiritual drink*; and *Chrysostom* saith upon it, *As thou eatest the Body of our Lord, so they did eat Manna; and as thou drinkest the Blood of our Lord, so they drank the Water of the Rock. To them he gave Manna and Water, to thee he gives his Body and Blood.* 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3. In loc.

(2) *The second Pretence of Scripture is from* Joh. 6. *where Christ saith*, vers. 41. I am the Bread which came down from Heaven. *And* vers. 50. This is the Bread which came down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not dye. *And* vers. 51. If a man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever. *By all which passages he teacheth one kind to be sufficient to salvation, especially when in the same chapter vers.* 11. *our Saviour multiplyed the Bread, but not the Drink.* Bellarm. de Euch. l. 4. c. 24.

Ans. 1. Though divers of the *Ancients* did apply this Scripture to the business of the Sacrament, yet properly it cannot intend that; the Sacrament not being instituted till above a year after this discourse of his: but plainly enough by Bread he means *himself*: It was *He*, not the Sacramental Bread *that came down from Heaven*. Tis a spiritual feeding on *him* by Faith, not meerly partaking of *Bread* in the Sacrament, that will *make a man live for ever*. And he speaketh so often of *Bread*, onely in

purſuance of the *Manna* which he had begun to ſpeak of; as in *Joh.* 4. he purſues the ſame thing under another ſhadow, to wit, of *water*, to the Woman of *Samaria*.

2. But if this place were meant of the Lords Supper, we cannot have a ſtronger *Argument* for the neceſſity of the *cup* therein, than from *verſ.* 53. where *Chriſt* ſaith, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of God, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*; the like *verſ.* 54 56. And then for the Miracle, as there is no ground to affirm, that that Miracle had any myſtical reference in it to the Lords Supper; ſo if it had, we might inferre as well, that his multiplying the Wine, *Joh.* 2. in *Cana*, doth as ſtrongly prove, and both alike, that we muſt communicate in *Wine* onely.

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 24.

(3) *The Third pretence of Scripture is from* Luk. 24. 30, 31. *Where it is ſaid*, that Our Saviour as he ſate at meat, took Bread, and bleſſed it, and brake, and gave it to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vaniſhed out of their ſight. *Here, ſay they, was the Sacrament; here was onely breaking of Bread; here could be no partaking of the Cup, for that he vaniſhed immediately out of their ſight.*

Eſtius in lib 4. d. 8. s. 11.

Anſ. 1. Here is no *direct* proof of the Sacrament: No ſaying, *This is my Body*; *Do this in remembrance of me*, which they grant to be neceſſary to a Sacrament. In other Scriptures, as *Mat.* 14. 19. & 15. 36. where there was no thought of a Sacrament, *Our Saviour* took Bread, and gave thanks, and gave it. Nay, here is great probability to the contrary; for this was in an Inne, their meeting and eating there not at all intended Sacramentally, no Wine conſecrated (which the Opponents ſay, is neceſſary.) That their *eyes were opened*, and they knew him *in the breaking of bread*, is no proof that it was the Sacrament; but rather, that then they did more ſtedfaſtly look upon him; and that breaking of Bread noteth the *time when*, not the *cauſe by which* they knew him; or poſſibly by his uſual manner of *Giving thanks*, and *breaking of the Bread*, they diſcerned who he was. And according to the ſence of this Anſwer, do ſpeak many learned *Expoſitors* even of their own.

Vid. *Suarez.* diſp. 71. de Sacr.

D. *Carthuſian.* in loc. *Janſen.* conc. Evang. c. 146.

2. Though it ſhould be granted, that here the Lords Supper was adminiſtred, yet it is apparent by the former anſwer, that here is no *full deſcription* of the Celebration of it: So that the Cup might as well be given though not expreſs'd, as that thoſe Diſciples did drink at their meal, though no ſuch thing be there mention'd. Neither is the Relation of an *Example* in an extraordinary caſe, ſufficient to cancel a direct *Precept* and cleer *Example* with it. The ſound uſe of the Notion of *concomitance* would here do well, to wit, that if this Phraſe do denote the Lords Supper, then both kinds (by an uſual *Synechdoche*) are meant, when onely one is mention'd.

Bellarm. de Euch. l. 4. c. 24.

(4) *The Fourth Pretence of Scripture is from* Act. 2. 42, 46. & 20. 7. *where it is ſaid, The Diſciples* continued in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and Fellowſhip, and breaking of Bread..... *And that* they were daily breaking

ing Bread from house to house. *And that* they met on the first day of the week, to break Bread. *In which places the Lords Supper is described only by breaking of Bread, not a word of the Cup.*

Ans. 1. It is not certain that under these expressions is meant the Celebration of the Lords Supper, (the more inconsiderate they who affect to term the Lords Supper nothing but *breaking of Bread*, when the Scripture hath given it a more specifical and honourable Name) for some of the *Learned* understand several of those places, of distributing their provision to those that were in want, or of their common refection together; *Their communion* (saith *Chrysost.*) *was with the Apostles not only in Prayers, but also in Doctrine and civil Conversatiion*; Or else of their *Agapæ* or *Love-feasts*, which were frequently held at the end of their Assemblies.

Cajetan in loc. *Beza* in loc. In loc. Serm. 6.

2. But if any of those places do point out the Lords Supper, we *answer*, that by a common *Synechdoche*, the one kind is put for both; nothing being more usual in Scripture, than to denote a compleat sustenance by *eating of Bread*, *Isa.* 58. 6, 7. *Luk.* 14. 1. which may the rather convince our Opponents, in that their *Council of Constance*, as they urged none of these places to this purpose, so they expressely yield, that this Sacrament was both instituted and used in the Primitive Church in both kinds: and it must be a clear and certain evidence, that must cross the Institution. Some few more *Scriptures* are pretended, but being wholly inconsiderable to this purpose, I think not worth the answering.

The Second Plea that is brought for Communion in one Kind, is from a Pretence of Reason. For, say they, *the whole Essence of a Sacrament is comprized in one Kind*; *and whole Christ, who is the Fountain of all Grace* (*both his Divinity and Humanity being now inseparably united together*) *is by way of* Concomitance, *his blood being now in his Body, exhibited in one Kind*; *so that there is no spiritual Fruit to be reaped by both, that is not to be received by participating of one kind*; *and therefore there is no need of both.*

Object. 2.

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 22.

Bellarm. de Euch. l. 4. c. 21.

Id. c. 23.

Ans. 1. We deny that the whole Essence of the Lords Supper is comprized under one Kind; for there is neither the *whole Sign*, the Cup being wanting, which signifies Christs Blood; nor the *whole thing signified*, which is such an intire refreshment of Soul, as Bread and Wine are of the Body. The Lords Supper is the Sacrament of Christs Body and Blood; but Bread is not the Sacrament of Christs Body and Blood; therefore Bread alone is not the Lords Supper.

Bonavent. in lib. 4. d. 11. p. 2. 2. 1. q 2.

2. The Doctrine of *natural concomitance* presupposeth Christs Natural Body to be contained *carnally* under the form of Bread, which will not only be denyed, but plainly disproved. Where Christs natural humane body is, there we grant, his Blood, and Soul, and Divinity also are, but that Body is now only in Heaven.

3. They who urge this Conceit, yet do grant, that *by vertue of the*

Aquin. p. 3. q. 76. a. 2. Corpus Christi non est sacramentaliter sub specie vini, nec Sanguis sacramentaliter sub specie panis. Ergo ut sacramentaliter sumatur Christus, necesse est, ut sumatur sub duabus speciebus. Alex. Alens. 4 part. q. 11. m. 2.

Sacramental words, only Christs Body is contained under the form of Bread; and then we conclude, that whole Christ is not therein *Sacramentally*. Christs body is not Sacramentally signified by the Wine; neither is the Communion of Christs Blood in this Sacrament, a work of Nature, but depends meerly on the Institution and Promise of Christ, and to be measured thereby.

4. Though his Body be now accompanyed with blood in Heaven, yet this Sacrament was instituted to shew the Passion of Christ when he was on Earth, which was with the pouring out of his blood; and blood poured out of the veins cannot be said to accompany or be conjoyned to the body. Our Saviour would represent himself here not as *a Lamb*, but a *Lamb sacrificed*, and therefore the blood is severed from the body: As the Money is not a Prisoners Ransome, while it lies in the Chest, but when it is paid; so the blood of Christ *as shed*, is our Ransome. And though now his blessed body and blood cannot be severed asunder, yet the *Signs* of them are by his own appointment severed, and no man can drink the blood of Christ in eating of the bread. *The bread we break is the communion of his body*, and *the cup we blesse, is* still *the communion of his blood*. And themselves affirm, that their Efficacy is but commensurate to their Significancy, and it is manifest, that the bread doth only signifie the body of Christ, the wine only his blood.

Vasquez t. 3 in 3 disp. 215. c. 2. Illa tamen, quæ est sub duabus, est majoris meriti, tum ratione augmentationis devotionis, tum ratione fidei dilatationis actualis tum ratione sumptionis completioris. Alex. Hilens. part 4. q. 11. m. 2. So Vasquez.

5. Though no more profit were to be received by partaking of one kind, than of both (which yet some of *their own* deny, who say, that more *Devotion* is raised, more *Faith* exercised, and a more compleat *refreshment* obtain'd by both than by one) yet more humble *obedience* is expressed to the will of the *Law-giver*, who appointed both, and thereby shewed the use and need of both.

Object. 3. Bell. de Euch. l. 4. c. 24.

The *Third Objection* that is made against the peoples use of the Sacred Cup, is *Pretence of Reverence to the Blood of Christ, which by the promiscuous use of the Cup, might easily be spilt; especially where there is but one Dispenser of the Sacrament, and many Communicants; that it would be lost on the long Beards of the Laity; that being kept long, it would grow musty; and that to impropriate it to the Clergy, would at the same time preserve a great Reverence both to it and to Them also in the eyes of the Vulgar.*

Ans. 1. God forbid that any of us should conceive, or express any thing irreverently of our dear Redeemers Blood; no nor of the outward sign thereof. But doth not this *Objection* reflect upon the *Author* of this Sacrament, that did so institute it, and upon all the Ancient Church that so used it, and yet such danger in it? yea, who communicated, and that in great numbers, at the least, every Lords Day? And may not the sacred Bread fall down and perish in like manner? But this pretence many of the *Fathers* in their own *Trent-Council* smiled at; well knowing that the Church for above a thousand years in her greatest straits and persecu-

Hist. Conc. Trid. p. 585.

tions.

tions, kept up a *due reverence* together with the *constant use* of this Sacred Cup.

2. But the *second part* of the *Objection* is not so easily answered; namely, that by this restraint, the *honour of the Clergy*, who are one time or other partakers of it, may more shine forth. For it is easier to answer ten arguments, than one corrupt affection. But this is the wrong way of contracting Reverence and Respect; for men thus *to seek their own Glory, is not Glory*; nor can any man expect, that God will bless those methods, that do so plainly cross his *will*. And indeed this very thing, the *Clergies honour* and that *proud fear of being thought fallible* in any thing, lest Truth should get further ground, together with their *ill-naturedness*, that therefore will deny a thing, because others desire it, are the greatest *reasons* of the present Church of *Rome* for this their Sacriledge.

The *Fourth Pretence* they have, is of *Authority*. They say, *That the custom of communicating under one kind, being rationally introduced, and long observed; the Church having now a greater liberty, than the Church had under the Law, though she have no power to alter things of a Moral, but only such as are of a Positive nature, hath fixed it as a Law in several Councils, and therefore it is to be so received and obeyed. And in case of disobedience, the secular Arm is to be called in, which one of them confesses in this case to be the most necessary Argument.* Object. 4. Bell. de Euch. l. 4. c. 28. Gerson.

Ans. 1. That such a custom of communicating under one kind is crept into some part of the Church, is certainly true; but that it was *rationally* introduced, or hath been *anciently* used, is certainly false. For how can that be usher'd in with any *reason*, which is directly against Christs *command?* whenas also every succeeding Councel is ashamed of the grounds their Predecessors went upon, and one might referre it to any man that is not drunk with prejudice, whether there be one good Reason for this alteration among all the number. And that it hath been for a long time used, is so false, that Authentick Writers in every age of the Church stand ready at a call to evince, that the ordinary and publick celebration of this Sacrament was still in both Kinds. The *Roman* cause being most indefensible in this point, even by their own usual Weapons. Vid. *Catech. Rom.* p. 2. pag. 201.

2. The Universal Church of God hath no Authority to prohibit what God commands. In *alterable* circumstances, she may wisely and modestly use her power; but to change the Testamentary Institution of Christ her Lord and Husband, she will not dare. *What the Master commands, the good Servant will not forbid.* St. *Paul* saith, *the Church is subject to Christ*, and therefore may not oppose her self to Christ: for that (as *Aug.*) *he alwayes determines aright, but Ecclesiastical Judges, as men, are often mistaken.* The Ministers of Christ are indeed the *Dispensers* of the Mysteries of God, but not *Lords* to dispense with them and alter them at their pleasure, but must dispense them according to Christs Institution. Contr. *Cresc.* l. 2. c. 21.

Institution. And then for the Churches liberty, it consists in having fewer and more easie Ordinances than under the Law, and Grace to make her members willing to perform them; but it consists not in an uncontrolled power to adde, alter, or diminish the Institutions of Christ. *He that breaketh the least command, and teacheth so, hath no place in the Kingdom of Heaven.* The *Roman* Priest may not alter or omit one Ceremony in the *Mass*, and must they adventure to omit this sacred Symbol of Christ's appointment?

3. The Determination of the *Church of Rome* is nothing to the *Universal Church*; being not a *fourth* part thereof, nor having any Jurisdiction over other Churches by any Law of God. These pretended Councils that have so boldly determined against the plain Word of God, have also herein opposed former Councils; in which case *Themselves* tell us, that if Councils are at odds with one another, and their Definitions irreconcileable, we ought to take part with the *ancient* against the *latter*. And as for that at *Constance*, which first determined this case, it was neither a *General* Council, no Bishop from the *Eastern Church* being there, nor wholly approved by the *Romanists* themselves, who do some of them profess, That it did decree *against the Order of Nature, manifest Scriptures, and all Antiquity*, in other Cases, and who then would heed them in this? The like may justly be said of that at † *Basil*; save onely, that they were more kind than their Successors were, in granting upon some Conditions the Cup to the *Bohemians*.

Conc. Nic. Calcedon Ancyr, &c.

See Dr. *Featley's Grand Sacriledge*, p. 172.

Gratian. Dist. 50.

Bellarm. de concil. c. 7. *Alb. Pighius.*

† *Hujus concilii nihil est ratum & probatum, nisi quædam dispositiones circa beneficia. Concilium vero ipsum reprobatur in Conc. Lateranensi ult.* Sess. 11. Bell. de Conc. c. 7.

And thus you see the utmost strength of our *Opponents* in this point. A heap of meer *Pretences*, neither grounded on Scripture, Reason or Antiquity, but meerly supported by *feeble Arguments* and *strong Power*.

IV. I now proceed to the *Fourth* thing promised, and that is some *Application* of all this to our selves.

Use 1. See here *the Abundance of our Saviours Love and Care towards his Church*. He was not content onely to *dye* for us, but he ordained for our comfort this thankfull *Memorial* of his Death; and that on purpose to help our Faith and Comfort; and to this end appointed not onely *his flesh*, but *his blood* to be given, that if *one kind* did not sufficiently quicken and strengthen us, *the other* should be presently applyed, to perfect that good work in us. For he knew that we were dull of Apprehension, and hard to be wrought upon. To see *his Body bruised* for a poor Sinner, that may work compunction, and erect a staggering Faith; but to see again *his Blood*, wherein is a mans life, poured out; and to drink this also as an assuring Pledge that he dyed in the sinners stead, how will this fill the believing Soul with joy and comfort! The Blood of God, that will surely expiate the sin of Man. To support a poor Beggar with a piece of Bread, that's kindness; but to quench his thirst

thirst also that's double Mercy. This is the Mercy of our Redeemer. He calls, *Come, eat of my Bread, and then drink of the Wine that I have mingled.* Not onely, *Eat O Friends, but,* saith he, *Drinke, yea drink abundantly, O beloved.* O Love without comparison! the same Hands that have been lift up against him, the same Mouth that hath dishonoured him, shall yet taste that Blood, one drop whereof is of more value than Heaven and Earth. When *Alexander the Great* was married to *Statira* the Daughter of *Darius,* he had six thousand Guests, and gave to each of them a Cup of Gold; but here are more Guests to be served, and richer Gifts that are bestowed. Here our dear Redeemer opens a wide Fountain for a world of sinners; and 'tis onely *Wash and be clean.* That blessed Truth is unquestionably here confirmed, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *The Blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.* Thus he hath chosen by *Two things,* wherein it is impossible to lye, to exhibit a bleeding Saviour to cure a bloody Sinner.

Use 2. See *here the presumptuous Sacriledge and Injustice of the Church of Rome.* To corrupt Christs last Will, and to serve his Family by the halves. To darken so clear an Institution, and defeat so plain a Command. How will our dear Saviour resent so great a wrong? He so free in *shedding* his Blood, they so cruel in *refusing* it. He so carefull to make and seal his blessed Testament, they so studious to deface it. The Master of the House appoints such provision for his Children, the Steward withholds the one half, and then thinks to appease their Appetites with *Distinctions.* He that takes so kindly *a cup of cold water* given to a Disciple, must needs take it unkindly when his own *Cup of Blessing* is denyed them. What Article of Religion can be safe in such hands? what intelligent man will imbark himself in such company, that will overturn all Scripture and Antiquity to establish their Conceits? that will privily tax Christ himself of weakness, and openly wrong his whole Church at a blow.

Indeed if this Device had had any tendency to promote *Love to God* or *true Piety*; if it had been bred and born in the Church time out of mind, their zeal and fondness for it might the sooner be forgiven: But to struggle so hard for a Tenet that can no way pretend to promote true Religion, a Tenet that was never publickly own'd in any Church for 1400 years; to deny the Wine in the Sacrament to the People, and yet *the very Vessels* still extant in some of their Vestries, by which they conveyed it to the Peoples Mouths: To make such a bare-fac'd Error tantamount to an *Article of Faith,* and then to Accurse them from Christ, that shall endeavour after his Blood; what shall we say to these things? yea to say, as one of their *Cardinals* did in the Colledge, that to yield the Cup to the Laity, was to offer them *Poyson instead of Physick,* (he had not forgotten that *wretched Monk* that poyson'd a Christian *Emperour* with the Cup at the Sacrament); to declare,

Card. S. Angel. Hist. Conc. Trid. p. 516. *Bernard. Henr.* 6.

clare, that to ask the Cup favoured of *Hereſie*, and was in ſhort a *mortal ſin*, as ſome of them ſaid in the meeting at *Trent*. Theſe things do raiſe their Guilt to a very great height, and would inforce all conſidering men to bleſs themſelves from ſuch a Society.

Ric. de Vercelli Abb. Preval. Hiſt. Conc. Trid. p. 637.

The uſual Refuge of theſe men, when they are baffled by the *Scriptures*, is to ſhelter themſelves in *Tradition*, under *Councils*, or among the *Fathers*; but in *this point* the more ingenuous of them do confeſs that all are againſt them, and the more impudent make but feeble Defences from them. Divers of their own *Biſhops* in the very Councel of *Trent*, argued and voted for the Truth. Several *Princes* of that Religion interceded for it, and afforded the Cup to their Subjects; and a great *Prelate*, when no good would be done therein, writes to *Caſar*, that no relief was there to be expected, where Voices were alwayes numberd, never weighed. And is not the force of Truth very great, when it extorts an Approbation, even from the Party that oppoſeth it? And it is not long ſince a Conceſſion of both Kinds was ſignified to this very Nation, on condition that we would come over to them: Thus God himſelf ſhall not have his will, unleſs withall they may have theirs.

Ferdinand Emperour. K. of *France*. D. of *Bavaria*. K. of *Poland*. *Dudithius* Ep. Quinq. Ep. ad *Maximil.* 2. *Cambden Eliz.* pag. 59.

And yet this is that Church which ſo many extoll; that is ſet out by ſuch alluring Beauty, and wherein ſo many blind Soulds are hearded: A fit Religion for thoſe that reſolve to have none; and for ſuch Children who will renounce a *true Father* to obey a *falſe and cruel Mother*.

Uſe 3. See here *the Folly of ſuch among us, who deprive themſelves, both of the Sacred Bread and Cup in this Ordinance.* While we are vindicating one part of this Sacrament how many are ſleighting the whole?

1. *Some* do live in this ſin of Omiſſion out of *an Atheiſtical and profane Principle*, having no ſence of Duty, or Conſcience of Religion at all. *The Table of the Lord is contemptible to them.* Thus many hundreds and thouſands of Adult perſons never did once taſte of theſe Goſpel-dainties. Jeſus Chriſt ſaith, *Take, eat, this is my Body*; *Drink ye all of this Cup of Bleſſing*; but they flatly refuſe their Redeemers Command. Alas poor Souls! will ye never have any need of him? Can you ſatisfie the Juſtice of an offended God, by your own imperfect Righteouſneſs? with what face can you crave Attonement by *that Blood* which you have deſpiſed? how can you be ever cleanſed by that Blood which you have refuſed to drink? Bethink your ſelves, the Blood you contemn is nobler than any that runs in your veins. It is the Blood *of the Son of God*, to whom the ſtouteſt of you muſt flee firſt or laſt: and if you now turn the deaf ear to his gracious calls, how juſtly may he refuſe your cries in the day of your miſery. *Be wiſe therefore, and kiſs the Sonne, leſt he be angry, and ye periſh in the way.*

2. *Others*

2. *Others* neglect this Ordinance out of *a ſupine Negligence*, neither knowing their Duty, nor caring for any of theſe things. One would wonder how ſtupidly men do hear their Duty preſs'd upon them in this particular; not at all concern'd. They hold their Eſtates and Credits by another Tenure. Lands and Houſes paſs not by the Covenant of Grace, nor are ſealed with the Seals thereof. They imagine that to prepare for, and partake hereof, will ſomewhat diſ-eaſe them, and oblige them to the difficult and dreaded work of *Self-examination* and *Godly Sorrow*; and ſo they ſleep quietly in this notorious diſobedience. Hunger will haſte to Meat, Guilt to Pardon, Pain to Eaſe, Sorrow to Comfort: but where there is no ſence of the former, there is no haſte to the latter. O that ſuch would read and conſider that fearfull ſentence in a like caſe, *Numb.* 9. 13. *The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the Paſſeover, even the ſame Soul ſhall be cut off from his People, becauſe he brought not the Offering of the Lord in his appointed ſeaſon, that man ſhall bear his Sin.* And never imagine that Grace or Comfort will be found in Chriſt, without the uſe of his own Ordinances, nor the *End* attain'd without the *Means*.

3. *Others* do frequently deprive themſelves of the Lords Supper *for the ſake of ſome ſin or other*, (if the truth were known) which they are loth to leave. Thus Stomachs that are clogg'd with noyſome humours, quite take away the Appetite. If anger, malice, envy, unruly paſſions; if ſenſual delights be cheriſhed within, or be not heartily hated and mortified, there will be no room for the Blood or Grace of *Jeſus Chriſt*. But (Sirs) do you mean to live, and conſequently dye in theſe ſins? what then will become of you? If you do deſire to leave and conquer them, why do you avoyd the means? will any of theſe ſins excuſe your preſent Omiſſions? not at all. One ſin can never excuſe another. What Child or Servant will be excuſed from coming to meat when you call them, by ſaying, their hands are unclean, and they have no mind to waſh them? Do you conceit that there is more real ſweetneſs in your ſins, than in Chriſt? in the filth and dregs of the world, than in the Maker and Glory of the World? *Taſte and ſee how good the Lord is*, and let the *Love of Chriſt conſtrain* you to your undoubted Duty.

4. *Others* again do deprive themſelves of the Lords Supper *out of a ſuperſtitious Fear of approaching to it*; the rather, becauſe the Scripture ſaith, that the *unworthy Receiver becomes guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and withall *eateth and drinketh his own damnation*. Now a *Religious Fear* there ought to be, which ſhould not onely oblige a man to prepare himſelf for this Ordinance, but for every other. If it were a well-governed Conſcience that ruled them, it would make them as carefull of Praying and Hearing, as of Communicating; and it is moſt certain, that whoſo cannot rightly partake, can neither

rightly pray nor hear. And the *Danger* of miſcarriage is much the ſame in the one as in the other: for, to have the Word become a ſavour of death, and a mans Prayers to become ſin, differs nothing in effect from being guilty of Chriſts death, or of eating judgement (which *that word* doth properly import) that is, deſerving Gods Anger, and the effects of it to a mans ſelf.

A grievous ſin, this unworthy Receiving, (no doubt) but not unpardonable, nor ſuch as ſhould diſcourage the weakeſt child of God from ſincere Endeavours, and then a chearfull Communicating. For this Sacrament was never intended to *ſeal our Perfection*, but to *help our Imperfection*. If a Wife were lovingly invited to feaſt with her Husband, or a Child by a Father; would it not lay an imputation of an unſufferable ſeverity in the Husband or Father, or elſe of ſecret guilt, ignorance, or want of love in the Wife or Child, to refuſe to come, leſt they ſhould not be duely qualified? Even ſo in this caſe, Our *Bleſſed Redeemer* moſt lovingly calls us to his Supper; what other conſtruction can be made of our refuſal, but that either he is rigorous, or we faulty. In this caſe we cannot do better than like wiſe *Abigail*, 1 *Sam.* 25. 41. 42. when *David* ſent to take her to him to wife, *ſhe aroſe and bowed her ſelf on her face to the Earth, and ſaid, Behold, let thy handmaid be a ſervant, to waſh the feet of the ſervants of my Lord.* Here is a due ſence of her own unworthineſs. But in the next Verſe; *She haſted and aroſe, and went after his meſſengers, and became his Wife.* Keep up a due ſence of your own unworthineſs, but let not that hinder you from going, when he calleth you. If you periſh, yet periſh in a way of Duty. How many do we meet with, on their Deathbeds grievouſly troubled in Conſcience for their neglect herein? If you are unfit for the Lords Supper, you are unfit to dye; and how dare you live in a condition altogether unfit to die? O remember, that ſtinging Scripture, *Jam.* 2. 10. *If a man keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.*

Uſe 4. Laſtly, *Let us all take care to improve this Legacy, the bleſſed Cup of Chriſts blood.* That this point lye not, like grounds long in ſuit, barren and unprofitable. While there is ſuch ſtickling for the *Sign*, let us ſtrive after the *thing ſignified*. Shall we contend ſo earneſtly for this Jewel, and then not wear it? ſhall we venture ſo hardly for this water of *Bethlehem*, and then pour it out when we have done? O no, let us ſqueeze all poſſible vertue out of this Sacred Cup; let us go up by the ſtream, to the Spring; having opened the Shell, let us feed upon the Kernel. Let us remember Chriſts bitter Death and Paſſion for us. Is thy Heart impenitent? ſteep it in the blood of this Scape-goat. Is thy Faith weak and fainting? Here's Senſe to help thy Faith. Apply the mouth of thy Faith to his wounds, and *be not faithleſs but believing.* Is thy Conſcience unquiet? bring it to be there ſprinkled with the merit

of

of his Blood. Are thy ſins as many as the ſands? his blood is as large as the Ocean, to overflow them all. When this bleſſed Cup is poured out, let thy eyes pour down a flood of tears mixed of *grief* and *joy*: To ſee ſuch a Perſon pouring out his life by thy procurement, this ſhould melt thee with grief: To ſee the Price paid by that Blood for thee, ſhould lift thee up into a trance of joy. When thou takeſt that *Cup of Salvation*, think, *What ſhall I render to the Lord for this his benefit to me? Who is this that comes with died Garments from Bozrah? how glorious is he in his Apparel!* How bitter was his Paſſion! how ſweet his compaſſion to poor ſinners! *Be ye lift up, O my everlaſting doors, and let the King of Glory come in.* Bring him into thy Soul, and there feed upon him by Faith, and let *his fruit be ſavoury to thy taſte*. Inward Communion is the Crown of an Ordinance. *It is the Cup of the New Teſtament in Chriſts blood, which was ſhed for you*; receive it with Reverence, receive it with Thankfulneſs, receive it with Application, remember his Death, *remember his Love more than Wine*.

Let us not onely *defend* the Truth, but *improve* it. If we feel no vertue or comfort in the *blood* of Chriſt, we ſhall be tempted to throw away the *Cup* as well as others. When we find no marrow in the Bone, we throw it away. He that profits by Ordinances will beſt value them; he that is refreſh'd by Wine, will never cry down the Vine; but a formal partaker will eaſily be weaned; and when the Children do but *play* with the *drink*, the Father may juſtly take away *the Cup* from them.

SERMON XXIII.

Christ crucified, the onely proper Gospel Sacrifice.

Hebrews X. 12.

But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sate down at the right hand of God.

THE design of the Apostle in this Verse, with the Verse foregoing, is to set forth the Excellency and Perfection of our Saviours Priesthood, and his one Sacrifice, above the Levitical Priesthood, and the Plurality of Sacrifices by them offered under the Law.

This he doth by comparing them together, and by shewing wherein they agree, and wherein they differ, that so he might clearly illustrate the preheminence of the one above the other.

Their *agreement* consisted, (1) In their Office, they were both Priests: (2) In the Administration of their Office, they both did sacrifice.

Their *disagreement* consisted in these things following:

First, The Levitical Priesthood consisted of a Plurality of Persons, therefore *vers.* 11. called Priests, which, by reason of death, had many Successors But the Evangelical Priesthood consisted but of one single Person, our Lord Jesus, called in the Text, *this man.*

Secondly, As the Levitical Priesthood consisted of a Plurality, so did their Sacrifices; for they were also very many, and therefore called (*vers.* 11.) Sacrifices. Now you must understand the Apostle there speaking not only of a Plurality as to the Number of them, but likewise as to their

their several Kindes, for they offered not onely several sorts of Beasts, as Bulls, Lambs, Goats, but of Birds also, as of Turtle-doves and young Pigeons, *&c.* But the Sacrifice which Christ offered, was but one as to the Kind, which was that Body which was prepared, *Heb.* 10. 5.

Thirdly, The Levitical Sacrifices were *oftentimes* offered, (*vers.* 11.) but the Sacrifice of Christ was but *once* offered.

Fourthly, The Levitical Sacrifices could never take away sin, *vers.* 11. but Christ by his one Sacrifice, once offered, took away sins for ever; that is, took away sins fully and everlastingly; and herein it is, that the transcendent Glory of the Gospel Sacrifice, out-shines all the Legal Sacrifices, as much as the Sun doth all the Stars in their greatest lustre: for all those Sacrifices could never take away sin, which this one hath done perfectly.

From the words thus opened, I shall gather these four Propositions.

1 Prop. *That Christ crucified is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.*
2 Prop. *That the Sacrifice of Christ is but of one Kind.*
3 Prop. *That this one Sacrifice of Christ was but once offered.*
4 Prop. *That this Sacrifice of Christ once offered, was so compleatly efficacious, as that it took away sins fully and for ever.*

The first Proposition opened.

That Christ crucified is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.

Here I shall explain, First, Why I say it is *divine*: Secondly, Why a *proper Sacrifice*: Thirdly, Why the *onely* proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.

First, I call it a *divine* Sacrifice, because its Institution and Appointment is of God: Let the matter of a Sacrifice be never so excellent and precious in the Eyes of Men, yet except God hath legitimated and sanctified it by his Appointment, it would prove but an Abomination in the Eyes of God. As suppose one should offer up the Fruit of his Body for the sin of his Soul, which is a kind of Sacrifice, than the which there is nothing a man can more highly value, and more hardly part with, which yet *Abraham* was ready to have done in his *Isaac* at Gods Command, whereby he did wonderfully signalize his Faith, and obtained favour with God. But when apostatized *Israel* essayed to give a like testimony of Honour to a mistaken Deity, the Lord by his Prophet *Jeremiah* doth not onely charge them with Idolatry, but likewise with the Kind of Sacrifice that they offered, which was of their Sons and Daughters, of which he saith, *which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination.* So that every Sacrifice that hath not the stamp of Divine Authority to legitimate it, is not to be accounted of as

as Divine, or of any worth or acceptance with God. But now I say, that this Sacrifice of Christ crucified, is of Divine appointment, and so a Divine Sacrifice: This is clearly asserted by the Apostle, *Heb.* 10. 5, 6, 7. *Psal.* 40. 6. *Wherefore, when he cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not, but a Body hast thou prepared me.* v. 6. *In Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure: Then said I, Lo, I come, (in the Volume of the Book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.* Mark that; Christ took up a Body, in order to be sacrificed, instead of all Legal Sacrifices, and this in complyance to the Will of God, which he farther explaineth *vers.* 10. *By which Will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* The summe of what the Apostle saith is this, That God would be satisfied with no Sacrifice but that of his Son, and that with this Sacrifice he would be pleased, and therein would accept of all that should believe. The Conclusion is this, That because Christ was crucified at the appointment of God, (as I have proved) therefore I call Christ crucified a *Divine Sacrifice.*

Secondly, I say further, that Christ crucified, is not onely a *divine* but likewise a *proper* Sacrifice, and that for this Reason: Because the most essential Properties of the most perfect Sacrifices under the Law, which were those that were Expiatory, I say the Properties of such kind of Sacrifices agree to this of Christ crucified.

There are Four Properties of an Expiatory Sacrifice, all of which, I shall shew you, do agree with this of our Christ crucified.

1. The first Property of such a Sacrifice is, that it be of some *living Creature* slain, and its blood shed, and offered up unto God; this is so evident to any that hath but any knowledge in the Laws of God concerning the Nature of his Sacrifices, that it will seem a needless matter to adde any thing for the illustration or proof thereof. Certain it is, that the Holy Scriptures, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek, use such words for a Sacrifice as do include a slaughter in them; the one being זֶבַח the other θυσία; and the Apostle throughout this Epistle, speaking of Sacrifices, whether they were of Bulls, Goats, or Lambs, he all along maketh mention of their Blood shed, which cannot be but with their slaughter: so that there is nothing more evident, than that slaying and shedding of blood is the Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice. Now it is as clear, that our Christ crucified had this property, for he was nailed Hands and feet to the Cross, and through those wounds bled to death; besides, when dead, the remainder of his Blood issued from his side, pierced with a Souldiers Spear: this blood thus shed, the Apostle *Peter* calls *precious blood*, and withall calls it *the blood of a Lamb without blemish*, therein alluding to the sacrificed Lamb under the Law; of which shadow Christ the Lamb of God sacrificed under the Gospel is the substance. From what hath been said, it is evident that this first property of an Expiatory Sacrifice, doth fully comport with the death of Christ.

2. The

2. The ſecond property of a Sacrifice, is that it was offered to God for the *Expiation of Sin*: This was the End of the *Levitical* expiatory Sacrifices, as the Apoſtle tells us, *Hebr.* 9. 7. when he ſaith, *Into the ſecond Tabernacle went the High-prieſt alone, once a year, not without blood, which he offered for himſelf and Errors of the People*; which is as much as if he had ſaid, That the blood of thoſe Beaſts he had ſacrificed, he took with him into the Tabernacle, and there offered it to God for his own and the peoples ſins. Now though he tells us, *Heb.* 10. 4. that *it is not poſſible for the blood of Bulls and Goats to take away ſin:* which ſeems at firſt ſight very harſh, that thoſe Sacrifices that were appointed to be offered for ſin, and yet that they could not, when offered, poſſibly take ſin away. But let the Apoſtle anſwer for himſelf, as he is beſt able, which he doth *Heb.* 9. 9. compared with the 13th *verſ.* In the ninth verſe, he tells you in what ſence they could not take away ſin: *There were offered* (ſaith he) *gifts and ſacrifices, that could not make him that did the ſervice perfect, as pertaining to the Conſcience.* The meaning of which words I ſhall rather give you in the Paraphraſe of Learned Dr. *Hammond*, than in my own; which are brief, full and plain. "Thereby, (*ſaith he*) is meant, That all theſe Legal Performances will "not be able to give any man confidence to pray unto God, to bring "him to Heaven, or to obtain for him the pardon of any wilfull or pre-"ſumptuous ſin in the ſight of God, or free him from any ſin that hath "waſted his Conſcience, or give him grace to purge himſelf from ſuch "ſin. In all theſe reſpects thoſe Legal Sacrifices could not poſſibly take away ſin. But you will ſay, In what ſence did they take away ſin? The Apoſtle will tell you, *verſ.* 13. *If the blood of Bulls and Goats ſanctifieth to the purifying of the fleſh.* He had told you before, that they could not make perfect as pertaining to the Conſcience; but now he ſaith, as to the *fleſh*, thoſe Sacrifices did purifie, and ſo in a ſort did take away ſin. By *fleſh* is here meant, the Outward man conſidered in his External priviledges as to his Judaical Church-ſtate, of which Priviledges this is the ſumme, *viz.* Communion with that Church in External Ordinances of Worſhip, from which upon every Ceremonial Uncleanneſs the *Jew* was excluded, but upon offering up of a Sacrifice for his cleanſing, his fault was paſs'd by, and he was re-admitted to his former Communion; and theſe were the Errors of the Prieſts and the People, from which upon their offering of Sacrifices they were cleared. And now you ſee the Objection removed, and yet the Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice cleared; and that is, that it was offered for the taking away of ſin. And now let us apply this Property of a Sacrifice to Chriſt crucified, and ſee whether it doth not thereto agree.

I ſay therefore, that anſwerably Chriſt was as a Sacrifice crucified, and therein offered up to God for the Expiation of ſin. This is fully aſſerted by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. 14. *How much more ſhall the blood of Chriſt, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himſelf without ſpot to God,*

God, purge your Conscience from dead works, to serve the living God: That is, if the Sacrifices of the Law so far availed as to the purifying of the flesh, the Sacrifice of Christ shall much more avail to purifie the Conscience; that is, so perfectly to settle and quiet the Conscience from the fears of the wrath of God for sins committed (which are the dead works the Apostle speaketh of) to this end among the rest, that the sinner thus quieted, might *serve the living God*, not slavishly, for fear of Wrath, but from Love, as becometh a gracious Child, whom his merciful Father hath so freely pardoned through the Sacrifice of his own Son. The consideration of this Verse, with that of the Text I am speaking from, is abundantly sufficient to clear up the second Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice to belong to Christ crucified, which is this, That every such Sacrifice was offered for the taking away of sin.

3. A Third property of an Expiatory Sacrifice is, that it was to be offered up by a *Priest* ordained of God to that end. To this very *end* (saith the Apostle *Heb.* 8.3.) was the High-priest (under the Law) ordained, *to offer gifts and sacrifices*. So that hence it is evident, that no Sacrifice was to be offered but by a Priest thus ordained: And was it not for *Sauls* presumption in this Kind, that lost him his Kingdom, *1 Sam.* 13.9. 13, 14.

Well then, if every Expiatory Sacrifice must have a Priest to offer it, so had our Christ crucified; for it was a Sacrifice offered up to God by himself our onely High-priest, being appointed to that Office by God. That Christ was appointed by God to this Office, is manifest from *Psal.* 110.4. *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedek*. That this is meant of Christ's being by God designed to this Office, is clear from *Heb.* 7.17. where the Apostle applyes this Prophesie to Jesus Christ. But farther, as from what hath been said, it doth appear, that Christ is a Priest ordained of God, so likewise it doth further appear, that this our High-Priest was he that did offer up himself as a Sacrifice to God, if you consider *John* 6. 51. *The Bread* (saith Christ) *that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world*. Now this flesh was given in his Death, which was given by himself when he voluntarily offered it up unto God in that most holy Sacrifice. So in *Heb.* 7.27. it is said, *Christ offered up himself*; Christ was not onely the Sacrifice, but the Sacrificer. So *Heb.* 9.26 *Now once in the end of the World, hath he appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself*. Nothing more plain, than that Christ in these places is to be understood both as Priest and Sacrifice.

But it may be objected, How can Christ be said to sacrifice himself, whenas he did not kill himself, or shed his own blood; for he was apprehended by Order from the High-priest, led away as a Prisoner, arraigned and condemned unjustly, and in a violent cruel manner crucified by his malicious Enemies: He did not slay himself, but was slain by the *Jews*.

I answer,

I answer, Though he did not slay himself, for that had been self-murder, which had been a sin that had not become this spotless Lamb; but yet this is evident, that he did offer up himself to be slayn by them, in complyance with the Counsel of his Father, and in complyance with all the Prophecies of the Old Testament, that foretold he must be cut off for the People. *O fools* (saith Christ to his doubting Disciples,) *and slow of heart, to believe all that the Prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things?* Ought he not? that is, was it not his Duty, in complyance with his Fathers will, who had designed him thereto, and foretold this his designation by his Prophets. But from the History of the Manner of his Death, it is very clear, that Christ did very readily offer up himself as a *Victim* to be slain for the sins of his people. For first, he knew when he went his last journey to *Jerusalem*, that his hour was come, and yet he went up, *John* 12. 23. Then he knew also that *Judas* at that time designed to betray him, but he was so far from seeking to prevent it, that he rather seems to hasten it, when he sayes to *Judas*, *What thou doest, doe quickly.* Then again, when his Enemies came to apprehend him, he sought not to escape them, but going forth, *Joh.* 18. 4. saith, *If ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, I am he.* And when he was in their hands, he could (as he tells them) but pray to his Father, and of him obtain an Army of Angels to his rescue, but would not; for having received a Body for to sacrifice, and the hour of offering it up being come, he most willingly surrendered himself to his Enemies for the slaughter: And this is agreeable to what he sayes, *Joh.* 10. 15. 18. *I lay down my life for the sheep, no man taketh it from me*; that is, not against my will, but I lay it down of my self. And thus it became our High-priest to doe, who had the Sacrifice of himself to offer by himself. And thus have I shewn, how the Third Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice belongs to Christ crucified, it was to be offered by a Priest ordained by God, and such an ordained Priest was Christ, who at Gods appointment offered up himself.

4. The Fourth Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice regularly offered, is, that it was of a *sweet savour unto God*; that is, it was highly pleasing, and graciously accepted of by him. This is evident from what God himself hath said, concerning such Sacrifices, *Levit.* 1. 9. *The Priest shall burn all on the Altar, to be a Burnt-offering of a sweet savour unto the Lord.* This is repeated again and again, *vers.* 13. 17. Now that this Sacrifice of Christ crucified might in no case fall short of those Legal Sacrifices, the Apostle, *Ephes.* 5. 2. doth apply the very same Property to this Sacrifice of Christ, in these words, *Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an Offering, and a Sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour.* And certainly, there was never any thing in this World acted to a greater Satisfaction to the most High God, than this of Christs dying for sinners, of which God hath given this testimony, that he hath so highly exalted him, as a Reward of these

his Sufferings, according to the Apostle, *Philip.* 2. 8, 9. *Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross: wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow*, &c. And what signifies this Honour God hath heaped on him for his Sufferings, but that this his suffering death was highly pleasing, and of a sweet savour to him. Thus have I in four things shewn you how evident it is that Christ crucified is a proper Expiatory Sacrifice, as having all the essentially necessary Properties of such a Sacrifice. Which was the Second point in the first Proposition to be cleared.

There is one thing more in the first Proposition, to be cleared up and proved, which is, *That Christ crucified is the Onely proper Gospel Sacrifice.*

I say, it is the *onely proper Sacrifice* of the Gospel,

First, That I might exclude all Judaical Sacrifices, which till Christ, were of God, both commanded and accepted, but since his coming, and since he hath offered up himself, all those Sacrifices are now abolished, God taking no longer any pleasure therein, *Hebr.* 10. 6. *In Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure: Then said I*, (that is Christ) *I come to do thy Will, O God*; that is, to sacrifice my self: in this latter he hath pleasure, but not in the former, which are therefore taken away.

Secondly, I call Christ crucified the *onely proper Sacrifice*, to exclude the *Romish Masse*, which those pretended Catholicks would fain have us believe to be a *proper* Sacrifice. and the very same with that of Christ crucified, but how groundlesly I shall shew afterward.

Thirdly, I call it the *onely proper Sacrifice*, to distinguish it from several other *improper Sacrifices* under the Gospel, as that of doing good and communicating, of which the Apostle saith, *With such Sacrifices God is well-pleased*, *Heb.* 13. 16. Such is that of devoting ones body to the Service of God, called *Rom.* 12. 1. a *living Sacrifice*; so is that of offering Praise, *Hebr.* 13. 15. These I acknowledge have the name of Sacrifices under the Gospel, but there is no man doubteth, that they are improperly and onely by way of Allusion so called: for as a Sacrifice is a Holy thing offered up to the Lord, so is doing Good, devoting ones self to Gods Service, and offering Prayse to God, holy things also, and so metaphorically called Sacrifices; but in these Performances, there is no slaying, or shedding of Blood, or making Attonement for sin, which were necessary to speak them proper Sacrifices. Thus much shall suffice for the clearing up of the third and last part of the first Proposition, which now I conceive I have sufficiently proved, *That Christ crucified, is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.*

The

The Second Propoſition.

That this Sacrifice is but of one kind.

Such is part of the meaning of the Apoſtle in the Text, when he ſayth, *But this man when he had offered one Sacrifice*; he means not one only in *number*, but as to the *kind*; of this latter I ſhall now ſpeak.

It is well known that the Sacrifices of the Law were of diver kinds of Beaſts, as Bulls, Goats, Lambs; and of Birds, as Turtle-doves and young Pidgeons. But the Sacrifice of the Goſpel is but of one kinde, which is the Blood of Jeſus, which through the Eternal Spirit was offered up to God.

But it may be asked, why the Sacrifices of the Law were of divers ſorts, ſince they were to ſhadow forth the Goſpel Sacrifice, which was to be but of one ſort or kind?

I anſwer, it might be for this Reaſon, Becauſe that the Goſpel ſacrifice was to be of that abſolute Perfection, both as to its Matter as well as Ends, that no one kind of Legal Sacrifice could fully repreſent; and therefore it was, that ſeveral ſorts of Creatures that had very different qualities, were elected and appointed by God, to typifie out by parts, what was ſummarily comprehended in that one Sacrifice of Chriſt. As when God appointed the Bull for the Sacrifice, ſince that Creature hath an excellency of ſtrength ſuperior to any other Beaſt of the Field, it might be to ſhadow forth the very great ability of our Lord Jeſus for this undertaking. Then again, there was choyce made of another ſort of Creature, which had not that eminency of ſtrength as the Bull, but was ſuperiour in Meekneſs and Innocency; ſuch was the Lamb, to ſet forth that remarkable Meekneſs and Innocency of our Saviour in the ſacrificing of himſelf, of whom the Prophet ſaith, *He was led like a Lamb to the ſlaughter, and as a Sheep before the ſhearers was he dumb, he opened not his mouth.* So alſo was the Goat called out for a Sacrifice, not ſo much to ſignifie any quality of Chriſts own Perſon, but rather the Nature and Qualities of thoſe Perſons in whoſe ſtead he dyed, which were Sinners; for as the Goat is noted to be a Beaſt of a very luſtfull nature, and of as ill a ſavour, ſuch alſo are ſinners, full of ſtrong and loathſome luſts, of a very ill ſavour in the Noſtrils of the Holy God. Now Chriſt being to repreſent the Perſons of ſuch in whoſe ſtead he dyed, was therefore typified forth by this ſacrifice of a Goat. To adde to theſe, there was alſo ſacrificed Turtle-doves and young Pidgeons; now this is obſervable of this ſort of Birds, that there are no Birds ſuperiour to them in love and faithfulneſs to their Mates; by which might be ſhadowed forth the incomparable love and faithfulneſs of Jeſus Chriſt to his Church, whom he loved, and bought with his own Blood: never was Turtle-dove ſo tender of, and faithfull to his Mate, as Chriſt hath been and is to his Church. So that all the qualities of thoſe ſeveral ſorts of

Legal Sacrifices meeting in our one Sacrifice of Christ, they were set in conjunction to be his Type, and did more compleatly display the Nature of his Sacrifice, than if but any one of them had been appointed for that use. And this I conceive is the Reason why the Sacrifices of the Law were of divers sorts, and yet they were all but the Type of one single Sacrifice of the Gospel. Thus have I briefly illustrated the second Proposition.

The Third Proposition.

That this one Sacrifice of Christ was but once offered.

This is clear to them that consult these following Scriptures: *Rom.* 6. 10. *He dyed unto sin once.* Hebr. 7. 27. *He needeth not to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the Peoples, but this he did once, when he offered up himself.* Heb. 9. 26. *But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* Vers. 28. *So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.* Heb. 10. 10. *By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the Body of Christ, once for all.* 1 Pet. 3. 18. *For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust.* Now certainly, the Holy Ghost would never have layd such an Emphasis upon the singularity or Oneness of Christs Sacrifice, as apparently he doth in those Scriptures now named, were it not for very good and very great Reason, and what is that but to signifie, that this one Sacrifice, once offered, was every way compleat, and sufficient for the full obtaining of all the Ends of a Sacrifice.

That this Sacrifice once offered, was sufficient, I prove these three wayes.

First, Because it was as often as God required. *This commandment* (saith our Lord) *have I received of my Father, that I should lay down my life for my sheep, and take it again,* Joh. 10. 15, 18. Hence it is certain, that his Father would have him lay it down once, and then to take it again: But was it his intent he should take it again to lay it down again? not so; for then, since he hath not yet come to die again, it would be our duty to expect him a second time to die for us; but this we expect not, indeed he will come a second time, but (as the Apostle saith) *without sin*; that is, not to bear again, the punishment of sin, as he did in his once dying: but then he will come *to salvation*; that is, to perfect that salvation to his Saints, for whom he purchased it by his once dying. But our Saviour puts us out of doubt in this particular, inasmuch as he hath told us, he will die no more, *Rev.* 1. 18. *I was dead, but I am now he that liveth, and behold I live for evermore*; which he could not have said, but that he knows, that his Father requires no more deaths at his hand than what he hath already payd.

Secondly, This once was sufficient, because it was as much as the Law required,

required. The Law was to *Adam*, That *if thou eatest of the forbidden Tree, thou shalt die the death threatned*, was but once to be executed; and therefore Christ being the sinners Surety, could not be bound to pay more than the sinners debt, this is clearly and fully asserted by the Apostle, *Heb.* 9. 27. As *it is appointed* (that is, by the Law) *unto men, once to die, and after this to judgement*, so Christ was once offered to *bear the sins of many*; that is, Christ was once sacrificed to take off that Curse of once dying, that by the Law was threatned to the sinner. The Law being thus compleatly satisfied by Christs thus once dying, it was a very needless matter upon this account for Christ to die a second time.

Thirdly, Christs dying once was sufficient, because it was as much as the sinner needed.

This will be best understood, if we take an Account of the sinners wants.

(1) It is evident, that by sin the Holy God was provoked to Anger, and therefore the sinner wanted a Reconciliation, which this one Sacrifice once offered hath procured, *Ephes.* 2. 16. *Christ hath reconciled both* (that is, Jew and Gentile) *unto God in one body, by the Cross*; that is, he (by his once offering up himself in Sacrifice to God) hath made the believing sinners peace with God, whether he be Jew or Gentile.

(2) Again, the sinner hath forfeited his life to the Justice of God by sin; answerably, Christ by his once dying hath discharged the Law of Death, and procured for the Believer a glorious Resurrection to an Eternal Life.

(3) Again, sin had blinded and hardned the sinners Mind and Conscience, as to the things of God, so that he became so utterly unable to help himself, that he neither knew the Law of God, or if he had known it, he was not able to submit himself to that Law, being at enmity thereto. But Christ by his one Sacrifice once offered, procured a new, gracious and everlasting Covenant, one of the principal Promises whereof is, That God will put his Laws in their Minds, and write them in their Hearts, *Heb.* 8. 9. that is, he will so enlighten their minds, and sanctifie their hearts, as that they shall not onely know, but readily obey him in whatever he commandeth: Now this Covenant and this Promise is the Purchase of this one Sacrifice once offered.

(4) Lastly, Sin had got into the sinners Conscience, and so fired it with the flashes of Guilt, and allarum'd it with the Threatnings of the Law, and so affrighted it with the wrath of God, that the poor sinner could find no ease or quiet: But this once offered Sacrifice hath so purged the Conscience from dead works, (*Heb.* 9. 14.) that the Soul finds it self at ease, that it can serve the Lord without distraction, for being fully perswaded (that sin being pardoned, and God at peace through this blood) that it shall never fall under condemnation, it hears no more of the boysterous storms of the Law and Conscience, but enjoyes a great calm all its dayes.

Now

Now if Christs once offered Sacrifice hath both satisfied God, answered the Law, and every way supplyed the sinners lacks, it cannot be imagined what room should be left for a repetition of the same Sacrifice. And therefore, being we are assured, that Christ was to do nothing impertinent and in vain, we are upon the same ground assured, *That he was to be sacrificed but once*, which is the third Proposition.

The Fourth Proposition.

That this Sacrifice of Christ once offered, was so perfectly efficacious, as to take away sins fully and for ever.

This Proposition is clearly contained in the Text: For when it is said, *This man after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins for ever*, the words [*for ever*] are certainly to be referred to the Efficacy of this one Sacrifice once offered; for it there stands opposed to the inefficacy of the Legal Sacrifices, of which he had said *vers.* 11. *they can never take away sin*; the meaning is, that what all the sorts of Sacrifices often offered under the Law, could never doe, that this one Sacrifice of Christ once offered under the Gospel, hath done perfectly to the Believer; that is, hath not left one sin unpardoned, but hath taken away every sin everlastingly.

1. I say first, it was so efficacious as to take away all sins to the true Believer fully and compleatly; nor can the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. mean any thing less when he saith, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that dyed.* Certainly, if there is no judge to be found in Heaven or Earth that can justly condemn the Believer, then there is no sin that the Believer stands guilty of, but all must be pardoned: For was there but one sin unpardoned, there would be found Judges enow to condemn him. But whence is it that the Believer becomes so secure? The Apostle tells you the Reason, and that is, *Christ hath dyed.* Again, this may farther be confirmed from *Acts* 13. 38, 39. *Be it known unto you therefore, Brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe, are justified from all things* (that is, all sins) *from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses:* The meaning is, That through the Death of Christ is preached the Remission of all sins, from which ye could not be freed by all the Sacrifices of the Law of *Moses*, what those Sacrifices could not doe, that the one Sacrifice of Christ once offered, hath done fully.

And not onely so, for as his one Sacrifice once offered, took away or procured the pardon of all sins to the Believer, so it took them away *for ever.* This it hath done by procuring the second Covenant, which hath this Promise, *Heb.* 8. 12. *I will be mercifull to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more:* To remember them no more, is as much as if it had been said, They shall be everlastingly

lasingly forgiven, so that not one of them shall ever rise up to the condemnation of the Believer. The Conclusion is this, that if all sins are eternally pardoned to the Believer, upon the merit of this one Sacrifice once offered, then is this Sacrifice a most compleat and efficacious Sacrifice, nor doth the Believer stand in need of any other Sacrifice, no nor of the repetition of this very same Sacrifice, which is the fourth Proposition, and is now (I conceive) fully proved.

Having thus clearly and briefly confirmed the *Protestant Doctrine* concerning that great Article of the proper Gospel Expiatory Sacrifice, which doth highly concern every Sinner to understand, without which it is impossible for him to know how or which way he may attain to the Remission of his Sins, and the salvation of his Soul: I come now at length to take a view of the *Romish* Doctrine, concerning their vain, impertinent, blasphemous and idolatrous Sacrifice of the *Mass*. I call it *vain* and *impertinent*, because by the one Sacrifice of Christ once offered on the Cross, God is sufficiently satisfied, and the sinner sufficiently secured: To what end then serves their pretended Sacrifice of the Mass? I call it *blasphemous*, because so derogatory to the Sacrifice of Christ, as if Christs Death on the Cross was not sufficient without the Auxiliary of the Mass to make an Attonement for sin, and save the sinner. I call it *idolatrous*, because they have made it a meer Idol, not only worshipping and adoring Sacramental Bread and Wine as their true Saviour, but in trusting therein for salvation as in Christ himself, than the which there was never any thing invented by the Devil himself, that was more Idolatrous.

But before I shall give you my Arguments against this Popish Doctrine of the Mass's being a proper Sacrifice, since I write principally for the information and establishment of our weaker Brethren, I shall first tell you what is meant by the Mass, the Doctrine whereof those cruel bloody Papists have formerly endeavoured to impose on the Faith of your Forefathers with Racks, Prisons, Iron Fetters, cruel Mockings, Faggots and Fire, and which assuredly they would by the same methods of savageness, instead of Arguments, endeavour to impose on you, if ever the Lord should be pleased to give you up into their hands for tryal, which the good Lord in mercy prevent.

Know then, that what we Protestants call (according to Scripture) the Lords Supper, that the Papists (according to the tradition of men) call the Mass.

But this is not all, for we differ from them not onely in the Name, but in the Explication of the Nature of the thing it self, as thus:

We Protestants hold, that in the Lords Supper after Consecration, there remains real Bread, and real Wine. But the Papists believe, that after the Consecration, or after the Priest hath pronounced these words, *This is my Body*, and *This is the New Testament in my blood*, &c. that the Bread and Wine are by a certain Miracle transubstantiated into the very same flesh and blood wherein Christ suffered on the Cross.

Again,

Again, we Proteſtants believe, that this Sacramental Supper of Bread and Wine, is a figure of the real Sacrifice of Chriſt crucified, appointed by Chriſt for the remembrance thereof, and ſo we doubt not to call it a figurative Metaphorical Sacrifice. But this will not ſatisfie the Papiſts, for they believe, that this Bread and Wine is ſo changed into the very ſame Body of Chriſt which was nailed to the Croſs, and into that very Blood that he there ſhed, and that conſequently it is a real proper and true Expiatory Sacrifice for our ſins, as that of Chriſt crucified on the Croſs; which is certainly the meaning of the Council of *Trent*, in thoſe words of the decree concerning this point. Speaking of the Maſs, ſay they, *Cujus Oblatione Deum eſſe placatum, & pœnitentiæ donum concedere, & peccata omnia dimittere:* i. e. That upon the offering of the Maſs, God is pacified, and Repentance, and Remiſſion of ſins given. And what can be ſaid more of the Vertue and Efficacy of Chriſt himſelf crucified?

In the next place, we Proteſtants believe, that in the receiving this Supper, as with our Bodies we eat real Bread, and drink real Wine, ſo our Souls by Faith do feed upon the real Body and Blood of Chriſt, that was once offered in Sacrifice for the reconciling us to God, for the Remiſſion of ſins, and the ſalvation of our Souls, which benefits we by Faith apply to our ſelves, for which we bleſs and praiſe God, who hath graciouſly beſtowed them on us, for the merits ſake of that one Sacrifice of Chriſt once offered. But the Papiſts believe, that not only their Souls by Faith, but likewiſe the mouths of their Bodies, do eat and drink in the Maſs, the very Body and Blood of Chriſt, as really as if they had eat him off from the Croſs, or drunk in his Blood as it iſſued out of his pierced hands, feet and ſide. In a word, the Papiſts have turned the Lords Supper into an abominable Idol, and take the Bread and Wine to be the true and real Redeemer of the World, and do as devoutly worſhip and adore it, as we do the God-man Jeſus now at the right hand of the Majeſty on high; which is Idolatry with a witneſs.

Having now ſhewed you what the *Romiſh* Maſs is, I now come to lay down thoſe Arguments which I ſhall draw from the precedent diſcourſe, by which I will prove, that this Maſs is no proper Goſpel Expiatory Sacrifice, which the *Romiſh* Church believes it to be.

The general Argument is this:

If the one Sacrifice of Chriſt crucified, once offered on the Croſs, is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Goſpel, as I have proved, then the Maſs is no divine proper Goſpel Sacrifice.

The Reaſon of the conſequence is this, becauſe the Maſs is another thing, of a very different nature from that of Chriſt crucified; and therefore being not the very ſame thing, it cannot be the very ſame Sacrifice; and if it be not the very ſame, it cannot be a proper Goſpel Sacrifice, becauſe that onely (as I have proved) is the onely proper Goſpel Sacrifice. This is ſo evident, that I ſee no poſſibility of evading the force of its Reaſon.

That

That then which remains to be proved, is this, *That the Mass is not the very same thing, and of the same nature with that of Christ crucified, and therefore cannot be the same Sacrifice.*

In this very point lies the very heart and life of the Controversie betwixt us and them, as is evident from the words of the Decree of the *Trent*-Council, which are these: *Idem ille Christus in hoc Missæ Sacrificio incruentè immolatur, qui in arâ crucis cruentè seſe obtulit, unâ eadémque existente hostia, eo qui nunc Sacerdotum ministerio offert, & qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi diversa.* The meaning whereof in short is this: That there is no real difference betwixt the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, and Christ in the Mass; it is the very same in both, onely differing in the Reason of Offering; for in the Cross he offered himself immediately, in the Mass he offers himself by the Ministry of his under-Priests. *Lib. 6. pa. 465: Hist. Concili.*

So then, since the whole controversie lies on this one point, all my Arguments shall be level'd against this their strong hold.

This then I shall prove, That the Mass is not properly the very self-same Sacrifice with that of Christ crucified on the Cross.

1 *Arg.* The Mass cannot be the same Sacrifice with that of Christ on the Cross, because Christ crucified was a Sacrifice of Gods appointment, and so Divine, which I proved in the first Proposition; but so is not the Mass, for God never appointed it for a Sacrifice, therefore it cannot be the very same: for were it the very same sacrifice, and yet never appointed of God to be a sacrifice, as Christ crucified was, then one and the same Sacrifice might be appointed of God, and yet not appointed of God, which is a contradiction. That the Mass, which we call the Lords Supper, was appointed by the Lord Jesus, for the remembrance of that one Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, I deny not. Nor do I deny, that the Mass is a proper Sacrifice by the Authority of Humane Tradition; a like Authority to that of the *Pharisees*, by which they would not eat except they washed, or by which they thought it lawfull to be cruel to their Parents, in not relieving their wants, under pretext of their *Corban*: But I deny it to be a Sacrifice by any Authority from God, or his Son Jesus: This was ingenuously confessed by *Ataides Lusitanus* one of the *Trent*-Council, who yet was stout enough in his belief of its being a Sacrifice by Apostolical Tradition, as he sayes, *Pro certo concludendum, Doctrinam eam Apostolicam esse Traditionem*; this I mention to shew he was a Papist. "But (saith he) whoever goes about "to prove it such from Scripture, doth but as it were goe about to build "Castles in the Aire. His words are, *Verum autem hoc solidum Argumentum debilitari ab his, qui aëria sibi struunt, è sacra Scriptura id elicere frustrà conantibus, quod nusquam ibi reperitur, atque adversariis veritatis calumnia violandæ ansam præbentibus, dum rident eos arenâ laxâ ac instabili ædificare.* So far he. I know hereby he disgusted the Council, but that's nothing to me, so long as he speaks words of sober- *Lib. 6. pa. 444. Histor. Concil. Trident.*

ness, I value him not a jot the less, nor his testimony. But have they any Scripture wherein the Mass is directly called a Sacrifice? No; they pretend not thereto: but they say there are many places of Scripture from whence it may be directly gathered, the examination whereof I shall referre to the conclusion, for it were too long a business to speak to them all in this place. At present I conclude, that if they have no ground from Scripture to conclude it a Sacrifice, that then they have no ground to believe it such by Divine Authority; but such ground we have to believe that of Christ crucified to be a Sacrifice, therefore they are not the very same Sacrifice; at least they have no ground to believe so: But as I said, for the proof of its having no Divine Authority for its being a Sacrifice, I referre to the close.

2 *Arg.* The Mass cannot be the same Sacrifice with that of Christ crucified at *Jerusalem*, because Christ there crucified was a proper Sacrifice, as I have proved in the first Proposition; but the Mass cannot be a proper sacrifice, therefore it is not the same, and so no Gospel sacrifice; the reason of the consequence is this, that if the Mass is an improper sacrifice, and Christ crucified a proper sacrifice, and yet the Mass and Christ crucified were one and the same sacrifice, then the one and the same sacrifice of the Gospel would be both a proper and an improper sacrifice, which is a contradiction. That the Mass (if it be a Sacrifice) is not a proper sacrifice, I prove by these four following Arguments.

(*Arg.* 1.) A proper Expiatory Sacrifice hath this property, it consists of some living creature slain, and its blood shed and offered up unto God. But the Mass consists of no living creature slain, and its blood shed and offered up to God. The former I have proved in the first Proposition: The latter I prove from the Papists own confession. For they say not, that Christ is slain, and his blood shed in the Mass: and therefore in the forequoted Article of the Council of *Trent*, they say, that in the Mass, *Christus incruentè immolatur*, that is, they acknowledge the Mass is a sacrifice without blood. Which is absurd in the nature of the thing; for we may as well conceive of a Fire without heat, as a sacrifice without blood, for as heat is of the Essence of fire, so is blood of an Expiatory Sacrifice: Beside, it is flatly contradictory to that saying of the Apostle, applyed by him both to the Expiatory sacrifices of the Law, and that also of the Gospel; of both which he saith, *Without shedding of blood there is no remission*, Heb. 9. 22. Yea, say the Papists, but there is, in contradiction to the Apostle, for the Mass is a sacrifice Expiatory of sin; and yet therein there is no Remission. This is the first.

(*Arg* 2.) The Mass can be no proper Expiatory sacrifice, because it wants the second Property of such a sacrifice, which is this, that every such sacrifice takes away sin, and if it be a proper Gospel sacrifice, it takes away sin by vertue of its merit. But the Mass is no such sacrifice that takes away sin: The former I have proved in the first Proposition. The latter I thus prove: The Mass is not a Gospel sacrifice expiatory

of

of sin, because, if Christ hath by his one sacrifice, once offered, taken away sin fully and everlastingly (as I have proved;) then is there no sin remaining for the Mass to expiate. Sin as to the Curse is the sinners Debt, Christ hath payd that debt, in his being once offered, to the utmost farthing; for thereby, as I have proved, God was satisfied, the Law discharged, and the sinner perfectly relieved: so then, if there is no sin left for the Mass to expiate, it's impossible that God (that appoints nothing in vain) should appoint the Mass as a sacrifice to no purpose. And therefore I say, it is no proper sacrifice.

(*Arg.* 3.) The Mass can be no proper Gospel sacrifice, because it hath no Priest assigned of God to offer it. The reason of this consequence is, because as I have proved in the first Proposition, that both the Legal and also the Evangelical sacrifice was by Gods special appointment to be offered by a Priest and none else. But the Mass hath no Divinely appointed Priest to offer it as a sacrifice; which is thus proved. If the Mass hath any Priest appointed of God to offer it as a proper sacrifice, this Priest must either be the High-priest, which is onely Jesus Christ, or some other inferiour Priests, delegated by Jesus Christ as his substitutes: But the Lord Jesus doth not offer the Mass in sacrifice here on Earth, in his own person, for he is in Heaven, and the Mass is offered on Earth; nor indeed do the Papists say so much; for their belief is, that Christ offers himself now in the Mass, *Sacerdotum Ministerio*, by the delegation of his Priests on Earth. But this cannot be true, for these Reasons.

First, Because there is not so much as the name of Priest throughout the New Testament, given to any such subordinate Officer of Christs Church. We read indeed of Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Presbyters, but not of Priests: and this indeed the Jesuite *Lorinus* confesseth, in *Acts* 14. 22. *de Sacerdote. Ab hoc abstinet Novum Testamentum, ut magis proprio antiqui Legis Sacrificii, concedo.* i. e. I grant, the New Testament abstains from the word Priest, as more proper to the ancient Sacrifice of the Law. Indeed the Apostle *Peter* calls the body of the Church a *holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices*, as prayers and prayses, and themselves unto God, which are all improper Sacrifices, and so is their Priesthood improper also; but of any proper inferiour Priest, we read not so much as of the Name (as I said) in the New Testament.

Secondly, Christ hath appointed no such inferiour Priest to offer him up as a proper Sacrifice in the Mass, because there is no such thing given in Commission by Jesus Christ to any Officers on Earth, to offer up a proper Sacrifice. Indeed we read, Christ sent them to teach and baptize, to feed the flock, and to rule and govern them in the Lord, *&c.* but not a word of offering up any proper sacrifice. Some indeed of the Papists urge, *Hoc facite, Do this in remembrance of me*, for to warrant them herein, but others of them are ashamed of such an Interpre-

tation, as I shall shew afterwards. But if (*hoc facite,*) *Do this,* is as much as, *Sacrifice this* in remembrance of me, then all to whom Christ said *Do this,* must be understood to lie under the Command of *sacrificing* this, and so instead of making some Priests, we should make the whole Church proper Priests, for they are all bound to eat and drink the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, in remembrance of him: but I know they are not willing to make their Priesthood so common.

But yet again, there can be no inferiour proper Priests designed by God to offer up a proper Sacrifice under the Gospel; for if there be, they must be either after the Order of *Levi,* or of *Melchisedec.* Not after the Order of *Levi,* for that is no Evangelical, but the Legal Priesthood; nor after the Order of *Melchisedec,* for that only is appropriate to the person of our Lord Jesus, *Heb.*7.3: And if any inferiour Church Officers shall presume to assume to themselves a Priesthood after that Order, it is but reasonable (upon demand) that they should shew us, that they have the qualifications of that Order, which are reckoned there by the Apostle, as he must be such an one who is a King as well as Priest, *vers.* 1. then he must be without Father, without Mother, without descent, having neither beginning of dayes, nor end of life, made like unto the Son of God, and who abideth a Priest continually: Such a one indeed is Jesus Christ, but shew us such another on Earth, and we will believe him to be of this Order; but untill then, we will be excused from believing any such inferiour *Priests* after that Order; and if there be none such, then is there no such proper Gospel *Priest*; and if there be no such proper Gospel *Priest,* then is there no proper Gospel Sacrifice for such to offer.

The *Papists* much deceive themselves, to think that the Gospel Ministers execute this our *Melchisedec*'s *Priesthood* on earth; for as *Melchisedec* the Type had no successor or delegate to officiate in his room, so neither hath Christ in this great Act of his *Priesthood,* which lies in offering up of a proper sacrifice. And indeed, to what purpose should he have any successor in this act of his Office, since his one sacrifice once offered, hath been sufficient to pardon the sins of the whole world, upon their Repentance, and Faith in him; and since he is now ever living in the Holy of Holies, as our High-priest, to make intercession through that same blood for us?

From what hath been said, it is evident, that under the Gospel Dispensation there is no man or men whatever, appointed by Christ as proper *Priests,* therefore there is no proper sacrifice on Earth to be offered, and consequently the Mass is no such sacrifice; for certainly, if he had ordained such a sacrifice, he would not have been unmindfull of ordaining a proper *Priest* for its Oblation.

(*Arg.* 4.) The Mass can be no proper Sacrifice Expiatory of sin, because it is not of a sweet-smelling savour unto God, which (I have proved) is a property of every sacrifice rightly offered.

That

That the Maſs is not of a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour unto God, I prove;

Firſt, Becauſe it derogates from the All-ſufficiency and Perfection of Chriſt's one Sacrifice once offered on the Croſs, as if that without the Maſs could not expiate ſin, and ſave the believing ſinner; ſuch a Derogation as this is blaſphemy againſt the Sacrifice of the Son of God, making it leſs perfect and efficacious than indeed it is: But a blaſphemous ſacrifice is not of a ſweet ſavour unto God, therefore the Maſs is no proper ſacrifice.

Secondly, The Maſs is an Idolatrous ſacrifice, therefore no proper ſacrifice of Gods appointing, as being not of a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour unto God. That it is Idolatrous, is evident; for what elſe is making a piece of Bread and a Cup of Wine the Redeemer of the World, and relying upon the Oblation thereof unto God, as upon the Redeemer of the World, for Life and Salvation. Such Idolatry as this is ſo far from being of a ſweet ſavour unto God, that it is as all other Idolatry an abomination to him.

I know their reply is, But if this Bread and Wine be truely the Son of God, then is it no Idolatry: which is as good an Anſwer as if the Heathen condemned for worſhipping a Stock or a Stone, ſhould reply, But if this Stock or Stone be really and truely God, then are we no Idolaters. But ſay the Papiſts, their Cauſe and ours is different; for when they ſuppoſe their Stock or Stone to be truely God, they have no Revelation for what they ſay; but when we ſay this piece of Bread is turned into God-man, we have a Revelation. Well; and what is this Revelation? Why this: *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, This is my Body. But how if you are miſtaken, (as we confidently believe you are) in taking a Figurative Expreſſion for a proper Expreſſion? Then you are Idolaters without doubt. But what a ſad condition are theſe poor men in, in the mean time, that have nothing to ſecure them from damnable Idolatry, but the Interpretation of a very ambiguous Text, and I am confident therein, that they are miſtaken.

Thus I have finiſhed Four Arguments, to prove the Maſs is no proper Goſpel Sacrifice.

I return now to ſuch ſort of farther Arguments, with which I began, to prove that the Maſs is not the ſame Sacrifice with that of Chriſt crucified, which is the only proper Goſpel Sacrifice, and that therefore the Maſs is no proper Goſpel Sacrifice.

3 *Arg.* The Maſs is not a Sacrifice of the ſame ſort or Kind with that of Chriſt crucified, and therefore it cannot be the ſame ſacrifice, and if it cannot be the ſame, it cannot be a proper ſacrifice of the Goſpel; for the proper Goſpel Sacrifice is but one, or of one kind, as I have proved in the ſecond Propoſition.

That the Maſs (if it be a Sacrifice, as the Papiſts ſay it is) is a ſacrifice of a different nature or kind from Chriſt crucified, I prove thus:

First,

Firſt, Becauſe the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs, was the Sacrifice of that very Body that was born of a Virgin (and not of a piece of Bread) by the overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt; but the Maſs (by the Papiſts own Confeſſion) is the Body of Chriſt made of a piece of Bread, not born of a Virgin, by the conſecrating words of a Prieſt, and not by the overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt: Now is it poſſible that one and the ſame body can be born of a Virgin, and not made of a piece of Bread, and yet be made of a piece of Bread, and not born of a Virgin; or that one and the ſame body can be begotten by the the overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt, without any conſecrating words of a Prieſt, and yet be produced by the conſecrating words of a Prieſt, and without that ſame overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt, by which he firſt received his body? Is it not a contradiction?

Again, The Body of Chriſt ſacrificed on the Croſs had blood, and blood which was ſhed; but the body of Chriſt in the Maſſe ſheds no blood, by the Papiſts own Confeſſion: For they ſay the Maſs is *Sacrificium incruentum*, an unbloody Sacrifice; now can a bloody Sacrifice and an unbloody Sacrifice be the very ſame, or of the very ſame kind?

Once more, The Body of Chriſt ſacrificed on the Croſs, had the ſhape and proportion of a Man, it was a Body that had head, hands, ſides, feet, at their due diſtances as other humane bodies have. But in the Maſſe there is no ſuch Body of Chriſt, in a like ſhape and proportion; for the Maſſe is a Wafer about the bigneſs of a ſhilling, that is not capable of any ſuch dimenſions, ſhape or proportion, that belong to an humane body. This doth ſo puzzle them, that it is a wonder to ſee into what confuſions they run, when they are put upon explaining how the body of Chriſt, with his humane dimenſions and proportions, can be contained in ſo ſmall a thing as a Wafer. Some ſay, it is there with diſtinction of parts as it hung on the Croſs: Others think, that is not likely, but they conceive Chriſts Body is in the Wafer as the Soul in the Body, that is, *Tota in toto, & tota in qualibet parte*, that is, the whole Body of Chriſt in the whole Wafer, and the whole body of Chriſt in every minute part of the Wafer: and what is this but to make Chriſts Body as a Soul, a meer Spirit, or elſe to make as many bodies of Chriſt in every Wafer, as it is diviſible into parts, which will be almoſt if not altogether infinite. Others, to mend the matter, ſay, that Chriſts Body is in the Wafer after the nature of other Bodies; that is, it is *aliquid quantum*, but yet this *quantum* is *ſine modo quantitativo*, which is as abſurd as the reſt; for theſe will have Chriſts body there, to be ſome long, broad, deep thing; but yet that it is long without length, and broad without breadth, and deep without depth; and if this is not to put on a brazen face, and to talk Non-ſence impudently, I know not what is. If any ſhall conſider theſe three differences (to mention no more) betwixt Chriſts Body on the Croſs, and Chriſts Body in the Maſs (as the Papiſts hold it to be) and yet will believe it is one and the ſelf ſame body, and the very ſelf-ſame

ſacri-

ſacrifice, without any real difference; I ſee not why they may not believe the veryeſt Impoſſibilities, and groſſeſt Figments that the Mind of man can poſſibly conceive.

But certainly, thoſe three differences are ſufficient to men in their wits, to ſpeak the Sacrifice of the Maſs (if it be a Sacrifice, as they would have it,) to be of a very different kind from that of Chriſt on the Croſs, and conſequently to be no true, proper Goſpel Sacrifice; becauſe (as I have proved) the true proper Goſpel Sacrifice is but of one kind. I would clear up this by a ſuppoſition of a like caſe. Suppoſe ſome perſons pretending to ſome great and infallible knowledge in the Myſteries of Nature, ſhould ſhew us a little, white, round thing like an half-peny Ball (for I will put that inſtead of the little round Popiſh Wafer) and ſhould with as great confidence endeavour to impoſe upon our Underſtandings, as the Papiſts do on our Faith, that this little round white thing is a Man, and that it hath fleſh, blood and bones, with all the diſtinct members of a Man. Upon this, we examining the thing as far as our Senſes and Reaſon can judge, we find it looks like a Ball, the cover upon the touch feels like Leather, the inſide ſeems to our feeling, as if it were ſtuft with hair or ſaw-duſt; withall, it hath the lightneſs and every other quality of a Ball. Certainly, if theſe Impoſtors ſhould be able by their confidence ſo far to prevail, as to perſwade us that it is a man, yet ſurely, we ſhould ſay, if it be a man, it is another kind of man than we are. So ſay I, ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, that the Popiſh little Wafer is the Body of Chriſt, and a Sacrifice; yet certainly it is another kind of Body, and a Sacrifice, than that which was offered on the Croſs: And (as I ſaid) if it be but admitted to be a Body and a Sacrifice, but of another kind, it is certain it cannot be the proper Goſpel Sacrifice, which I have proved already to be but of one kind, in the ſecond Propoſition.

4 *Arg.* The Maſs cannot be the ſame proper Goſpel Sacrifice with that of Chriſt on the Croſs; becauſe Chriſt on the Croſs was ſacrificed but once, but the Maſs hath been (by the Papiſts own confeſſion) offered as a Sacrifice above a Myriad of times.

That Chriſt the true proper Goſpel Sacrifice was offered but once, I have proved in the third Propoſition. That the Maſs hath been, and is offered a numberleſs number of times, the Papiſts will not deny. Now ſee what a contradiction follows: If Chriſt crucified, the onely proper Goſpel ſacrifice, was and ought to be offered but once, and the Maſs is the very ſame Goſpel proper Sacrifice that is and ought to be offered infinite times; then may one and the ſelf-ſame Goſpel ſacrifice be offered but one time, and yet infinite times; which is as much as to ſay, it is but once offered, and it is not but once offered.

Nor can they ſhift off this contradiction, by telling us, that Chriſts Sacrifice was but once offered with the ſhedding of his Blood, but it may be often offered without ſhedding of blood; I ſay this will not ſerve them.

them. Firſt, Becauſe a bloody ſacrifice and an unbloody ſacrifice cannot be the ſame: Nay, Secondly, I ſay, that an unbloody ſacrifice is a contradiction *in terminis*, for there can be no proper ſacrifice without ſhedding of blood. Laſtly, I ſay it is a diſtinction without any grounded difference, for the Scriptures do own a ſacrifice of Chriſt with the ſhedding of blood, but owns no ſacrifice of Chriſt without ſhedding of blood.

5 *Arg.* The Maſs cannot be the ſame Sacrifice with that of Chriſt crucified, becauſe Chriſt crucified was a ſacrifice that expiated ſin fully, and took it away for ever, as I proved in the fourth Propoſition. But the Maſs is not a ſacrifice of that efficacy, therefore it cannot be really the ſame with that of Chriſt crucified. This latter I prove thus: Firſt, Becauſe the Maſs takes away no ſin as a Sacrifice; for if Chriſt on the Croſs took away all ſin from the Believer everlaſtingly, (as I have proved in the fourth Propoſition, that it hath) then is there no ſin left for the ſacrifice of the Maſs to expiate. Secondly, The Maſs doth not take away ſin fully and for ever; for if it did, why is it ſo often repeated as it is by the Maſs-prieſts, who like the Prieſts of *Levi* ſtand daily miniſtring; which (as the Apoſtle ſaith) was an Argument that thoſe Levitical Sacrifices were weak, and could never take away ſin, and by a parity of Reaſon, ſo muſt be the Maſs; if it be a Sacrifice, it muſt be a very weak one that cannot remove ſin, and therefore is ſo often repeated by them. I conclude therefore, that the Maſs is not really the ſame ſacrifice with that of Chriſt crucified, and therefore no proper Goſpel Expiatory Sacrifice. And thus I cloſe up my Arguments againſt the Maſſes being a proper Sacrifice, all of them drawn from *Heb.* 10. 12. whence I took the riſe of my Arguments, and with which I ſhall ſhut them up. *But this man, after he had offered one Sacrifice for ſin, for ever, ſate down at the right hand of God.*

The Popiſh Arguments for the Maſſes being a proper Goſpel Expiatory Sacrifice, propoſed and anſwered.

Let us now ſee what they can ſay for themſelves, in the vindication of the Maſſes being a proper Expiatory Sacrifice.

Arg. 1. Their firſt Argument is this: *Melchiſedec* was a Type of Chriſt, but the Bread and Wine *Melchiſedec* brought forth (when he came out of *Sodom* to meet *Abraham*) was a real proper Sacrifice, therefore the Bread and Wine in the Maſs, or (as we ſay) in the Lords Supper, is a proper ſacrifice.

Gen. 14.11.

Anſ. This is wonderfull far fetch'd, but as it is, let us conſider it.

I ſay then, *Firſt*, It is but begg'd, when they ſay, that the Bread and Wine that *Melchiſedec* brought forth, was a proper Sacrifice, for Firſt, the Text calls it not ſo, nor was it of a nature capable of being a proper Expiatory

Expiatory Sacrifice, for that Bread and Wine had neither life to lose, nor blood to shed, which had been necessary to constitute it such a sacrifice. It is said indeed *Melchisedec* brought forth Bread and Wine, but it is not said he offered them up or sacrificed them: And certainly, to bring forth Bread and Wine is a phrase more suited to an Entertainment, and such most likely this was, if we consider the Occasion of his bringing them forth, which was in his meeting of *Abraham* returning from the spoyl of the spoylers of *Sodom*, it's likely he brought them forth for the refreshment of the tired Victors.

Again, If there had been any such mystery in this Bread and Wine of *Melchisedec*, as to typifie out the continuation of our Heavenly *Melchisedecs* Sacrifice in the Mass, is it likely that the Apostle in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, when he is designedly unfolding the Old Testaments Types of Christ and his Sacrifice, and then also when he singles out *Melchisdec* as an eminent Type thereof, and sayes much concerning the Priesthood of that *Melchisedec*, and of its likeness to that of Christs, as he doth *Heb.* 7. I say, is it likely in that place he would have said nothing of this Bread and Wine, if it had been such a considerable Type as the Papists would make it to be? And yet whoever consults that place, will not find one *iota* in it, nor in the whole Epistle, relating to this same Bread and Wine; nor doth *Augustine* take any notice thereof in his Comment on that Text. I conclude therefore, that this Text serves them but as a wooden Legge to a lame Cause, which they use for want of a better.

Arg. 2. There is another Argument they urge to prove the Mass is a proper Sacrifice, and it is from *Malach.* 1. 11. The words are: *From the rising of the Sun, to the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incense* (they read, but falsly, *a Sacrifice*) *shall be offered unto my Name for a pure Offering.* Now, say they, this being a Prophesie of Gospel times, there must needs remain some Sacrifice with the Christian Church, that may be offered up in every place, which Sacrifice can be onely understood of the Mass, for there is ne're another Sacrifice under the Gospel that can stand in competition therewith.

Ans. The Answer to this is as easie as the burning of *Hay* and *Stubble*; for the force of their Argument depends on a false reading of the Text; for it is certain, that the word מְקַטֵּר which they translate *Sacrifice*, signifies not *Sacrifice* but *Incense*, as it is in our *English* Translation. Now see the weakness of their Argument; *Incense* shall be offered every where, therefore the Sacrifice of the Mass shall be offered every where, now who knowes not that Incense is no Sacrifice?

But if you ask, what may the Prophet mean by these words? I answer, That by *Incense* he means the Prayers and other spiritual Oblations of the Christian Church, but especially Prayers, according to that of *Revel.* 5. 8. *The four and twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb,*

having every one of them Harps and golden Vials, full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints: By Odours is to be underſtood Incenſe, which is odoriferous; thereby ſignifying how ſweet and acceptable the Prayers of the Saints are to God. Now wherever Chriſt hath a Church, there he hath theſe praying Saints; ſo that this Propheſie is exactly fulfilled therein, without the Maſſes being a Sacrifice.

Arg. 3. Their other Argument is this: The Types and Shadowes of Chriſts Sacrifice, under the Law, were proper Sacrifices, as thoſe of Bulls and Goats, *&c.* Therefore the Sacrament at the Lords Supper (or the *Maſs* as they ſay) muſt needs be a *proper* Sacrifice, elſe the Legal Types will be more excellent than the Evangelical Type or Sacrament.

Anſ. I anſwer, this Argument halts down-right, both in its Antecedent, Conſequence, and in the Reaſon of the Conſequence.

(1.) As to the Antecedent, which ought to have been Univerſal, which it is not; for all the Old Teſtament types of Chriſts Death, were not proper Sacrifices, for the Brazen Serpent lift up on a Pole in the Wilderneſs, was a Type of Chriſt crucified, and ſo applyed by Chriſt himſelf, *Joh.* 3. 14. But the Brazen Serpent was no proper Sacrifice, which had no more Life to lay down nor Blood to ſhed than a Braſs Nail hath, and therefore utterly uncapable of being a proper Sacrifice. Now (ſay I) if but this one Type of the Law might repreſent Chriſt ſacrificed, and yet it ſelf be no proper Sacrifice, by a parity of Reaſon may the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper be a Shadow of Chriſt ſacrificed, and yet neither the Bread or Wine be a proper Sacrifice.

(2.) Then for the Conſequence, it is as unſound as its fellow, for it follows not, that becauſe the Types of the Law were proper Sacrifices, repreſenting the proper Sacrifice of Chriſt crucified, therefore the Sacraments of the Goſpel, ſhadowing forth the ſame Chriſt ſacrificed, muſt be proper Sacrifices alſo; becauſe that Baptiſm is a Goſpel Sacrament as well as the Lords Supper, and may typifie Chriſt waſhing us from our ſins in his blood, and ſo be a ſhadow of a Sacrifice; and yet I know none that ſay that Baptiſm is a proper Sacrifice.

(3.) As for the Reaſon of the Conſequence, that is very weak alſo, which is this, that if the Lords Supper be not a proper Sacrifice as well as the Legal Types, that then there is a greater Excellency in the Legal Types than in the Goſpel Sacraments; and why ſo? Becauſe, ſay they, proper Sacrifices are more excellent than meer commemorative Signs.

To this I ſay, the Legal Types compared with the Goſpel Sacraments fall under a three-fold conſideration.

1. If you conſider them abſolutely, as to the Nature of the things of which they conſiſt: The principal Legal Types of Chriſt conſiſted of the Fleſh and Blood of ſlain Beaſts; under the Goſpel, the Sacraments that ſhadow forth Chriſts Death, and our Benefits thereby, conſiſt of Bread, Wine and Water. Under this conſideration, there is no greater Excellency

cellency in these Types one above the other, than there is in the Nature of Bread, Wine and Water, above the Flesh and Blood of slain Beasts.

2. They may be considered with respect to the Sacrifice of Christ crucified, whom they all shadow forth; and in this respect they are equal, for they all were representative of the very same Christ crucified.

3. Lastly, they may be considered with respect to the different times, with the different advantages or disadvantages that respect their different Administrations; as the Law-types being before Christ was crucified, or the Gospel clearly or fully preached, by reason whereof those Types did more faintly and obscurely shadow forth this glorious Sacrifice of Christ crucified, which the Gospel Sacraments do more perspicuously perform, by reason of that clear Gospel Light that accompanies them; and it is upon this account that there is a transcendent Excellency in the Gospel Sacraments above those Legal Types, because hereby is more fully represented the incomparable Love of God to sinners in giving his Son to die for us, and thereby to purchase for us that full Remission of sins, and that glorious Eternal Life, with all other Gospel Priviledges: So that Gospel Sacraments cannot but influence our Minds and Hearts with more Light and Heat, and inravish our Souls with more Joyes, than possibly the dark Types of the Law could doe. I say therefore, upon this account it is that the Sacraments of the Gospel transcend the Sacrifices of the Law, and not as the Papists idly dream, because the Sacrament of the Gospel is a more excellent proper Sacrifice than all the Sacrifices of the Law. And thus much for answer to their third Argument.

Arg. 4. They have not done yet, in the next place they argue for the Masses being a proper Sacrifice from 1 *Corinth.* 5. 7. The words are these. *Purge out the Old Leaven, that ye may be a New Lump, for even Christ our Passeover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the Feast not with Old Leaven.* Hence, say they, if the Apostle in this place speaks of the Feast of the Mass, and withall sayes, that therein Christ our Passeover is sacrificed for us, then is the Masse a proper Sacrifice.

Anſ. To this I reply, First, It cannot be proved clearly, that the Apostle in this Chapter, or these Verses, is speaking of the Lords Supper, or Masse, as the Papists call it. Or Secondly, if that could be proved, it follows not, that therefore the Masse is a proper Sacrifice.

First, It is not certain that the Apostle speaks any thing in this place of the Lords Supper. For though he mentions a Feast, yet it is very doubtfull what kind of Feast he here means, for it may be onely a metaphorical Feast; and so *Paræus* and Dr. *Hammond* seem to understand it; that is, the continual Jubilee of a Christians Life, which consists of the Delicacies of Sincerity, without all Leaven of Hypocrisie, and of the

Peace and Joy that thence do arise, than the which there are no Feasts so delicious. Or Secondly, whether by Feast here he means the Love-Feast, (that carries that title in Scripture, and so doth not (as I remember) the Lords Supper, throughout the New Testament) which I think probable; for I find the Apostle *Jude* taking notice of this Love feast, upon a very like Occasion to that of the Apostle in this place to the *Corinthians*, as in *Jude* 12. The Apostle there is complaining of a sort of men that had crept into the Church, and thereby were admitted to the Churches Love-feasts, who made no other use thereof than to satisfie their Luxury, *feeding themselves* (as he saith) *without fear*: Of which persons, and of which practice, he saith, *These are spots in your Feasts of Charity*; answerably the Apostle *Paul* is in this Chapter to the *Corinthians*, (speaking of the incestuous *Corinthian*) exhorting the Church to cast him out as old Leaven; and one Reason is, that they may be able to keep the Feast without such old Leaven as this *Corinthian*, who by his presence was likely to leaven others, by a secret Infusion of that Principle, that such kind of Incest (of which he was guilty) was very lawfull, and thereby might endanger others.

Having said thus much, to shew how very doubtfull it is to understand of what Feast the Apostle there speaks. Let us now grant, that by Feast is here meant the Lords Supper, yet it follows not that therefore the Mass is a proper Sacrifice, for the meaning of the Apostle will be only this, that since Christ our Passeover hath been sacrificed for us, ἐσφαγη, and thereby hath (according to *Ephes.* 5. 25, 27.) sanctified a Church to himself, that he might present it glorious, *not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing*, that it might be holy and blameless; therefore (saith he) for this cause I exhort you to cast out this incestuous *Corinthian* from among you, and with him all other Leaven of Malice and Hpocrisie, that thereby as becoming a Church sanctified by Christs Sacrifice, ye may keep the Feast of the Lords Supper in a pure and sincere manner, answerable to these holy ends of his being sacrificed for you. And what now I pray, is in all this to prove this Feast a Sacrifice? for the Text sayes not, that this Feast is our Passeover sacrificed for us, but that Christ is our Passeover that hath been sacrificed for us, as the *Greek* word ἐσφαγη should be rendred, of which this Feast can be but the Commemoration, according to the Institution, where Christ saith, doe this in remembrance of me, and thus much for answer to their fourth Argument.

Arg. 5. In the next place let us consider their Argument for the Masses being a proper Sacrifice, drawn from the words of the Institution. As first they say, when Christ said in the Institution, *Do this in remembrance of me*, he meant, *Sacrifice this*: *Bellarmine* thinks he hath found out a demonstration of the point in the words (*Doe this*) *Certum est*, (saith he) *probari Sacrificium Missæ his verbis* (*hoc facite*). And why so I pray? They tell us, because in some places the words *doe* and *make* are used to signifie Sacrifice: As *Levit.* 15. and 1 *Kings* 18. 23.

Lib. 1. *de Missa cap.* 12.

Ans.

Anſ. But how weak and vain a Reaſon is this, to build a demonſtration upon? That becauſe that in ſome places of Scripture where the Context ſpeaks expreſſely of ſacrificing, and the Prieſts are commanded to doe or make the Sacrifice ready; that therefore in this place, (where the Context ſpeaks not any thing of a Sacrifice, to which (*Doe this*) in this place is to be referred) it ſhould ſignifie *Sacrifice this*, is a conſequence (I had almoſt ſaid) ridiculous. For if *Doe this* in this place muſt be taken for *Sacrifice this*, becauſe *Doe this* in ſome places ſignifies ſo much, why muſt not the ſame words in every place where they be found ſignifie the ſame, and then ſee what abſurdities will follow: As when *Gideon* deſtroyed the Altar of *Baal*, the men of the City ſaid, *Judges* 6.29. *Who hath done this?* The meaning muſt be, *Who hath ſacrificed this*, and ſo the pulling down of *Baals* Altar muſt be the ſame with ſacrificing on it. Again when Chriſt ſaith to *Judas*, *What thou doeſt doe quickly*, Chriſt muſt thereby mean, *Judas*, *goe ſacrifice quickly*; as if *Judas* his betraying of his Maſter, and ſelling him for thirty pence, was a ſacrificing Act? what can be more abſurd? But what ſhould I ſay any more thereto, this Interpretation is rejected by ſome of their great ones. *Eſtius* the Jeſuite ſaith, by *Doe this*, the Scripture means not *Sacrifice this*; his words are, *Quod verbum* (*Facere*) *ſit idem quod ſacrificare quomodo nonnulli interpretati ſunt, præter mentem Scripturæ.* And ſayes their learned *Maldonate*, *Non quod contendum illud Verbum* (*Facite*) *illo loco idem ſignificare quod Sacrificare*; as much as if he had ſaid, I believe *Doe this*, ſignifies no ſuch matter as *Sacrifice this.* If then ſome of their own acknowledge the weakneſs of this Argument, no wonder then if we reject it.

Arg. 6. But they have another Argument from the words of the Inſtitution, which is this. When Chriſt ſayes of the Bread, *This is my Body broken for you*; and of the Cup, *This is the New Teſtament in my blood, ſhed for Remiſſion of ſins*; they thence argue, Where there is a Body broken, and Blood ſhed for remiſſion of ſins, there is a proper Sacrifice; But in the *Maſs* or Lords Supper there is the breaking of Chriſts Body, and the ſhedding of his Blood for the remiſſion of ſins: Therefore----

Anſ. The Papiſts themſelves will ſave us the labour of anſwering this Argument, being rightly ſtated, as thus: Where there is a proper breaking of a Body, and a proper ſhedding of Blood for remiſſion of ſins, there is a proper Sacrifice; this is ttue: But in the *Maſs* there is a proper breaking of bread, and ſhedding of blood: This ſhould be the Aſſumption, which they themſelves deny; for *Suarez* the Jeſuite denies any proper breaking of the Body in the *Maſs*; For, (ſaith he) *breaking* in the proper and ſtrict Acceptation, ſignifies a dividing of the body into parts, but there is no ſuch diviſion of parts in the *Maſs*. Beſides, the Church of *Rome* hath left out of her *Maſs* the word (*broken*) uſed in the Inſtitution; and *Janſenius* a Papiſt gives the Reaſon why it is left out,

No

Ne eſſet locus abſurdæ intelligentiæ, quâ quis exiſtimare poſſit verè frangi corpus Chriſti; that is, leaſt any ſhould abſurdly think, that Chriſts body could be truely broken. And as to any proper ſhedding of blood in the Eucharift, *Bellarmine* himſelf diſowns it, ſaith he, *Sanguis Chriſti in Miſſâ non reipſa egreditur de corpore.* So the Jeſuite *Coſter*: The true effuſion of blood (ſaith he) which is by ſeperating it from the Body, was onely on the Croſs, in *Cap. 9. de Sacrificio.* And this is as much as any Proteſtant can ſay, in diſſolving this Argument; for if *breaking*, and *ſhedding of blood* in the Supper, is to be taken improperly, then is the Supper but an improper Figurative Sacrifice, repreſentative of the true proper ſacrifice, which we Proteſtants grant.

Arg. 7. The laſt Argument that (I ſhall take notice of,) they urge for the *Maſs* its being a proper Sacrifice, is from 1 *Corinth.* 10. 21. where, ſay they, the Apoſtle is comparing the Table of the Lord with the Altar of Devils, and the Supper of the Lord with the ſacrifices of *Jewes* and *Gentiles*; now, ſay they, if the Table of the Lord is as the Altars of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and the Supper of the Lord or *Maſs* is as the ſacrifices of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, then is the *Maſs* a proper ſacrifice, becauſe the ſacrifices of *Jews* and *Gentiles* were proper ſacrifices.

Anſ. Firſt, whereas it is ſaid, that the Apoſtle here compares the Table of the Lord with the Altar of Devils, that is falſe; for the compariſon is made betwixt the Table of the Lord and the Table of Devils; now who knowes not that there is a great difference betwixt a Table and an Altar, for on the Table the Worſhippers did eat, on the Altar they did ſacrifice; and who ever ſaid that Eating was a ſacrificing Act? nay the Papiſts themſelves will not dare to ſay, that Eating of the Maſs is a proper ſacrificing Act, except they have a mind to conſecrate all the people Prieſts, for they all eat of the *Maſs*, and yet none may lawfully ſacrifice but Prieſts.

Again, whereas they ſay, that the Apoſtle doth here compare the Lords Supper to the Sacrifices of *Jews* and *Gentiles*; this alſo is falſe, if you conſider the Sacrifices of either *Jew* or *Gentile* in the moſt proper and ſtrict acceptation thereof: for the Sacrifices of both the one and the other ſtrictly taken, was that part of the Beaſt that was offered up unto God or Devils on the Altar, and not that part which either the Prieſts or Offering people did feed on upon their Tables; though by an improper way of ſpeaking, thoſe parts that were eaten may be called Sacrifices, becauſe they were parts of thoſe Beaſts, ſome parts whereof were truely and properly ſacrificed on an Altar. That the meaning therefore of the Apoſtle in this place may be cleared, I ſhall give you the plain ſence of the Text, and not in my own, but in a Paraphraſe of *Ataides Luſitanus*, one of the Council of *Trent*. *Quod Paulus dicit de participando Sacrificio Judæorum & de mensâ Demoniorum, ſi accipiantur ritus à Deo per Moyſen inſtituti, & qui ab Ethnicis inter ſacrificandum adhibiti, non inde effici Euchariſtiam eſſe Sacrificium. Notum*

eſſe

eſſe apud Moyſen in ſacrificiis votivis, totam victimam fuiſſe exhibitam Deo, atque unam partem ejus igni abſumptum, quæ erat Sacrificium: ex eo quod erat reliquum, partem fuiſſe Sacerdotis, & alterum partem offerentis, utrumque partem ſuam comediſſe quicum ipſi collibitum eſſet; neque id vocatum ſacrificare, ſed ſacrificatum participare: Idipſum Ethnicos imitatos, etiam partem eam, quæ in Altari non abſumebatur à nonnullis vendi ſolitam, atque hanc eſſe menſam, quæ non eſt altare. Perſpicuum ergo Pauli ſenſum hunc eſſe, Sicut Hebræi partem eam manducantes, quæ ad offerentem ſpectabat nempe ſacrificii reliquias participes fiunt altaris, & Ethnici ad eundem modum, ità nos comedentes Euchariſtiam participare ſacrificium crucis. In Engliſh thus: When *Paul* ſpeaks of partaking of the Sacrifice of the *Jews*, and of the Table of Devils, if thoſe Rites (as they are inſtituted of God by *Moſes*, and accommodated by the Gentiles to their Sacrifices) be rightly conſidered, it will not thence follow, that the Euchariſt is a Sacrifice: For it is to be noted, that when *Moſes* ſpeaks of ſuch Sacrifices that belonged to Vows, he declares, that the whole *Victim* or Beaſt was to be brought before the Lord, one part of which was conſumed by Fire, which was the Sacrifice; of the other parts that were left, they were divided betwixt the Prieſt and the perſon that offered, both of which did eat their ſeveral parts as it beſt pleaſed them; but that eating was not called ſacrificing, but partaking of that which was ſacrificed. This very cuſtom the *Gentiles* imitated, for that part of the *Victim* that was not conſumed on the Altar, by ſome was wont to be ſold, and is that which *Paul* calls the Table, which is not an Altar. The perſpicuous meaning of *Paul* is, That as the *Jews* eating of that part which belonged to the Offerers, they thereby became partakers of the Altar; ſo we eating of the Euchariſt, do thereby partake of Chriſt crucified. Thus he: The ſumme whereof is this, that the Apoſtle doth in this Diſcourſe of his to the *Corinthians*, prove, that he that did eat at the Table of Devils, did thereby declare, that he religiouſly owned and worſhipped thoſe Devils as Gods, to whom part of that Beaſt of which they did eat, was ſacrificed, and that therefore he adviſed them as all Chriſtians, from a participation of thoſe Feaſts, which he ſayes is inconſiſtent with our Eating of the Lords Table, which ſignifies that we own that God to be our God, to whom (not what we eat is ſacrificed, but) to whom Chriſt was ſacrificed for us, a remembrance whereof is by Chriſts appointment to be had in his Church in this Supper; but this doth not at all prove the Supper to be a proper Sacrifice, any more than that what the *Jews* or *Gentiles* did eat at their Tables were proper Sacrifices. And thus I have anſwered their moſt material Arguments the Papiſts have for the proof of the *Maſſes* being a *Proper Sacrifice.*

From the whole Diſcourſe, let us make this improvement:

Firſt, Let us be awakened hereby to obſerve what the Apoſtle *John* hath

hath cautioned us, when he ſaith, *Little children, keep your ſelves from Idols*; For certainly, there hath not been a more abominable Idol ever invented than this Popiſh *Maſs*, wherein, to the diſhonour of our Lord Jeſus, a piece of Bread is made the Saviour of the World, and a proper Sacrifice for the pardoning of the ſins both of the Living and the Dead. And that which aggravates this kind of Idolatry is, that they make Jeſus Chriſt the Inſtitutor thereof, and the Holy God to be the Former and Faſhioner thereof, by the miracle of Tranſubſtantiation.

Secondly, Let us hereby be awakened into Reſolutions to keep cloſe to Jeſus Chriſt our great High-prieſt, our only Sacrifice, and Interceſſor at the Right Hand of God; from whom ſo many thouſand Souls have gone a whoring under the great Apoſtaſie, after this filthy Idol. Chriſt ſacrificed on the Croſs we know, and Chriſt at the Right Hand of God we know, but Chriſt made of a piece of Bread, and again ſacrificed in the *Maſs* we know not. You are certain Chriſt was once crucified, and that that once was enough to make your Peace, and ſave you; look not after any other Sacrifice, for doubtleſs, as the Apoſtle ſayes, *there remains no more Sacrifice for ſins.*

Thirdly, Bleſs God night and day that hath kept you from this Apoſtaſie, and pray God night and day ſtill to keep you, eſpecially in theſe times, when there are ſo many Seducers come abroad, to withdraw you from Jeſus Chriſt to this dumb Idol.

Many other things I might have added, but it is high time to make an End.

SER-

SERMON XXIV.

Purgatory a Groundleſs and Dangerous Doctrine.

---

1 Cor. III. 15.

But he himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by Fire.

THis Text, ſayes *Bellarmine*, is one of the moſt difficult, and yet moſt profitable of the whole Scripture, in that from hence the Catholicks conclude two great points againſt Hereticks, that of *Purgatory* and *Venial* ſins. L. P.

But as hard as the Apoſtles Text is, this ſort of Catholicks in drawing ſuch profound Notions from it, ſeem hard enough for the Apoſtle and his Text too; and I am much miſtaken, if *Paul* would not have been alike puzzled to have underſtood Them, as they are at a loſs to ſpell out the meaning of Him; it is not every one, nor may be, any one of that ſimple Age was aware of ſuch a thing as Pugatory or Venial ſin.

Auſtin it ſeems was of *Bellarmines* mind, as in the ſame place he quotes him, that this was one of the hard ſayings that *Peter* probably obſerved in *Pauls* writings, which we ſhould take heed of wreſting to our own deſtruction. *Auſtin* belike was wary, but others have ventured to bring it to the wrack, and made it ſpeak according to their mind, as reſerved and cloſe as it was, they will teach *Paul* to ſpeak plain, plain *Popery* ere they have done. And it is ſtrange to conſider how many hard Texts even in this obſcure matter they pretend to have for them, though in our Controverſies with them, we muſt wholly confine to plain ones: But theſe Magicians, in imitation as it were of *Moſes*, that eminent Man of God, are altogether for bringing water out of the

Rocks; if a place be hard in it ſelf, they think it will be too hard for us, and like a Mill-ſtone they caſt it upon us, urging us to give an evident ſence, or admit theirs; and while we are heaving to extricate our ſelves, they hope for this advantage over us, leiſurely to retreat from us, and before we overtake them agen, to prepare freſh work of the like kind for us; but it is a daſtardly Enemy that declines the open Field, and fights only for the Hedges and holes of Rocks, that it is greater difficulty to follow, than overcome them. To proceed:

An hard Text this is confeſſed to be, whereon we crave liberty to ſuſpect they may be miſtaken, and to ſuſpend our Faith till we have made examination.

But however a very *profitable* Text it is, if it affords ſuch Doctrines as forementioned, worth many thouſands by the year, I'le warrant you; for however ſome diſſemble the matter, on theſe ſuppoſitions it is, that Maſſes and Indulgences go off at the rate they doe: if Souls went forthwith to Heaven, they would not care a pin for them; if forthwith to Hell, they would deſpair of Benefit by them: But the Opinion of *Purgatory* makes them precious, eſpecially ſince, as is ſaid, *That Souls there are defective in merit, and cannot further merit in that ſtate themſelves*; they muſt needs, on this ſuppoſition, reckon themſelves more beholding to them that will impart of their Oyl to them; and in hope to partake of their Spirituals, can do no leſs than leave them a good ſhare of their Temporals.

Bell. *lib.* 2. *c.* 2. *de Purg.*

And to make them the more willingly give down their milk, *Aquinas* tells them, *That the Prieſts Prayers, Maſſes, &c. profit them when dead, by vertue of what they did themſelves while alive*; you may gueſs his meaning, The Prieſt ſhould profit him when dead, as his Purſe had profited the Prieſt when alive; and elſewhere he addes, *That Prayers are more effectual for us if we are particularly remembred, than if we are more generally recommended*; well, it is but meet that the Prieſt ſhould be particularly remembred, that particularly remembers us, and that ſomething ſhould be done, to rub up his memory of us in particular when we are gone: If *gain be godlineſs*, as ſome have ſuppoſed, certainly, this Doctrine of Purgatory is a prime Article of Religion; for all Experience as well as Reaſon teaches us, that it is a very *profitable* Doctrine.

Aqu. *Suppl. qu.* 71. *art.* 2.

Suppl. qu. 71. *Art.* 12.

The Saints in Heaven are high and ſtout, they will give us nothing; the Damned in Hell are a poor or ſurly Rout; the one do's not need our prayers, the other does deſpiſe our prayers; we muſt threaten men with this priſon of Purgatory, or they will never pay their debts to us, but rather than lye and rot there, we may eaſily conclude, they will compound with us here.

But for clearer procedure, it will be neceſſary to ſhew,

1. *What the Papiſts do mean by Purgatory.*
2. *Whether any ſuch thing is probably meant in this Text.*

3. *Whether*

3. *Whether the Word of God does any where give ground for ſuch a conceit, with that cogency eſpecially, as that we ſhould receive it for an Article of Faith.*
4. *I ſhall briefly conſider (as they deſerve) their Supplementary Arguments.*
5. *Shew what ground there is from Scripture to disbelieve any ſuch thing.*
6. *What evil conſequences there are of the Receipt of it.*
7. *And laſtly, I ſhall give you the genuine ſence of the place, and improve it.*

(1) *What do the Papiſts mean by their Purgatory?*

Anſ. That there is a purgation of our Souls preparatory to their immediate enjoyment of God, *we* freely grant to them, and that both in reſpect of Guilt and Filth; and many wayes we aſſign whereby this is done; eminently by the Blood and Spirit of Chriſt, hereby filthy wretches indeed are ſaid to be cleanſed, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10, 11. Chriſt was thought to have done this work effectually, what one way, and what another, *Heb.* 1. 3. and he reckoned ſo himſelf, as appears by his *ſitting down*; his coming therefore was foretold, as with Fire and Water, that are the great cleanſers amongſt us, *Mal.* 3. 2, 3. Moreover, as Inſtruments that are effectual through him, this purging work is aſcribed, ſometimes and in ſome part to the Word, *Joh.* 15. 3. *Purifie them by thy Truth, thy Word is Truth*; at other times, and in another reſpect to Faith, *Acts* 15. 9. *Purifying their hearts by Faith*; ſometimes to Afflictions, whence is that compariſon *Pſal.* 66. 12. *we went through fire and water*; ſo Afflictions are called, as being frequently uſed for our purging and cleanſing: ſuch a *Purgatory* we *Proteſtants* allow of; and are free to tell, that the place of it is this World; and that the Remainder of Sin, which ſticks to the beſt of us while alive, is concluded in death; whereby the Body is incapacitated, and all its *moral* as well as *vital* Actions terminated; and wherein the Soul is perfected by the immediate Viſion of God and Chriſt, into whoſe Image it is hereby changed, according to preſent Experience, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. and after Hope, 1 *Joh.* 3. 2. *We ſhall be like him, for we ſhall ſee him as he is.* Proteſtants Purgatory.

But this will not ſerve our Adverſaries turn, let us then hear and examine their Notion of *Purgatory*.

Bellarmine tells us in general, *That it is a certain place, wherein as in a priſon, Souls are purged after this Life, that were not fully purged here, to the intent they may enter pure into Heaven.* *Lib. 2. de Purg. c. 6.*

Let us inquire of him a little more particularly,

1. Where this place is?

He tells us, that *the Church has not defined it, and that there are eight ſeveral Opinions about it*; Fancy you ſee is fruitfull; here is ee'n every one his tale, but ſuch variety cannot but much pleaſe our company, *Ibid.*

yea and the Cuſtomers too; for if they like not one, they may take the other. But the generality of the Schoolmen will have it *in the bowels of the Earth, on the borders of Hell*; but be it where it will, I hope I ſhall never come thither; and, as I ſuppoſe they that thus inform us, had not been there; but all things are within the ken of the ſagacious Schoolmen.

Lib. 2, de Purg. c. 6.

2. Who are to goe thither?

Eight Opinions alſo are reckoned up about this: Some thought *all men, good and bad*; others, *both Men and Devils*; others *all and only Catholicks*, (alas poor Hereticks) and ſo he goes on to the full number, charging one or more Fathers with each of them; and yet all but the laſt were out, as he concludes in the cloſe of that Chapter; whereby I underſtand, that the Fathers are of no Authority, except when they ſpeak for one; and ſo we as well as they will be content to be determined by them.

Bell. lib 2. de Purg. c. 1.

But what at length is the true Opinion?

Id. ibid. *That Purgatory is onely for them that die with Venial Sins, or that depart, Cum reatu pœnæ, culpis ſuis remiſſis.* This is crabbed Lattine, you will pardon me, if I cannot ſtreight Engliſh it, I was almoſt ſtumbled before at *Venial ſins*, but my Author helps me to underſtand what he means by them; *ſuch as are worthy onely of a Temporal puniſhment.* Theſe are petty kind of ſins, but that Notion I paſs over, as like to be examined by a much better hand: That which do's moſt puzzle me is this *Reatus Pœnæ*, This *guilt of Puniſhment that remains when the fault is pardoned*; and this Difficulty I think not eaſie to get over: For what is Guilt without reſpect to a Fault? and what place has puniſhment after Pardon?

Lib. 1. c. 11. de Purg.

But this is the beſt account we are like to have of what is to be purged in This Purgatory; ſome pitifull little ſins, or ſuch that were pardoned before; in effect I perceive, that perſons that goe thither need only to be a little poliſh'd over. They are detained in that Priſon for ſome few Farthings, that Chriſt when he payd their debts left on the ſcore (alas for him, he was ſo poor) and for this they and their Friends muſt make a purſe, and ſo they may go out; if they have good helpers, that will go Pilgrimages, ſay Maſſes, or procure Indulgences for them, they may go out ſo much the ſooner, but if all lyes upon themſelves, they muſt tarry longer; and thank themſelves that by their Bounty they obliged no body they left behind them to merit a ſpeedy Releaſe for them; ('tis likely by this to go very hard with poor Folks and Churls) and to fright perſons into a readyer complyance with them, the Grievouſneſs of the puniſhment is ſet before them, Fire is the beſt that can be expected by them, and therein they may lye frying till the Reſurrection, in ſome thouſand years ſcarce making an Expiation.

And it is ſpecially remarkable, that perſons are not judged thither, *that the Fomes of ſin may be waſhed, nor for any evil habits, that they*

Bell. lib. 2. c. 9. de Purg.

may

may be amended, but purely that their leſſer debts (that Chriſt it ſeems had forgot, or was not able to diſcharge) *may by their perſonal Puniſhment, and their living Friends Piety and Prayers, be fully payed.*

And thus much for their Notion of Purgatory, as to its Place and Purpoſes.

(2) The Second thing to be inquired into is, *Whether it is this Popiſh Purgatory, that* Paul *means by the Fire in our Text?*

For my part I can hardly think it is, in that I find *Paul* ſuch a ſtranger in all his Writings to their Notion of it; *Venial ſins, Puniſhment after Pardon, Humane Satisfactions* by *tranſlation of ones works to another,* (when indeed no one has half enough for himſelf) *Prayers for the Dead,* and the like, which are Perquiſites of their Purgatory, he (good man) ſeeming utterly unacquainted with.

But he talks of Fire; and there is Fire in their Purgatory; what then? Are there not many Notions of Fire in Scripture? is not the Word, the Spirit, Afflictions, frequently ſet out by it? This they will not deny; there is no neceſſity then of interpreting this Fire by that of Purgatory; yea there is a great probability of the contrary:

1. In that it is certain, that the whole of *Paul's* Diſcourſe here is a Metaphor, and it is likely that it is metaphorical Fire, that this metaphorical Stubble and metaphorical Builder is in danger of.

2. Whereas Fire is twice uſed before, it is evident, that it is not there to be underſtood of Purgatory-Fire, and muſt be ſo confeſſed by themſelves; and therefore it is unlikely having other Fire at hand, he ſhould run to Purgatory to fetch Fire, unleſs he had been a Diſciple of *Ignatius*, that can never kindle Fire enough.

For inſtance, of the Fire *v.* 13. it is ſaid, *that it ſhall try every mans work*; whereas Papiſts will yield, Purgatory is not for *tryal* of mens Works, they are tryed and found ſlight before any one comes thither; nor agen, is Purgatory according to them, for *every one*, the *very good* and the *very bad* come not thither; therefore this cannot be underſtood of Purgatory-Fire.

Agen, the Fire which in the beginning of our Text is ſaid to *burn* ſome mens works, is the ſame with the Fire that *tryed* them, for *therein* ſome are expreſly ſaid to *abide*, and others to *burn*.

Moreover, their Purgatory Fire acts on Perſons, this on Works, and ſuch works as we cannot imagine how a material Fire ſhould touch, unleſs it can, as they ſay, *comedere ſecundas notiones*; for theſe works, as is clear by the Context, are corrupt Doctrines.

And what reaſon is there in this laſt clauſe to alter the Notion of Fire? One would eaſily conceive, that the Fire which the Builder eſcaped, was the ſame with that which burnt his Works, for we hear of no other that he was in danger by.

And if any Fire here ſpoke of, might be ſuppoſed to be underſtood meta-

metaphorically, much more this laſt, in that it is brought in with ſuch ſignal notes of compariſon, *ὡς δι*, yet ſo *as by Fire*.

You ſee then, that this Text that looks faireſt for their purpoſe of any in all the Book of God, is ſo far from a Cogency, that there is not ſo much as a probability of its meaning any ſuch thing: Hitherto then we muſt be excuſed from receiving this Doctrine as an Article of Faith to be believed on pain of Damnation, as *Bellarmine* urges it; for we ſee no tolerable grounds to take it up for an Opinion. There is ſuch a deal of force to be uſed to theſe words, to make them ſpeak to the Popiſh purpoſe, that we may perceive them loth to own it; and for my part, if they ſpeak no plainer, they ſhall ſtand by a while, till we have examined other witneſſes.

Lib. 1. *c.* 15. *de Purg.*

(3) Let us enquire, *Whether the Word of God does any where give ground for ſuch a Conceit, with that cogency eſpecially, as that we ſhould require it as an Article of Faith?*

The principal Texts they uſe either directly or indirectly, as tending to this purpoſe, I ſhall briefly examine.

Gen. 3.24.

The firſt I am ſure they can think on, (and that you will ſay is far fetched,) is *Gen.* 3. 24. where God is ſaid to have placed *a flaming ſword to keep the way of the tree of Life*; this flaming Sword, ſay ſome of them, was a witneſs to ſinners, that they muſt paſs through Purgatory into Paradiſe.

Anſ. If we mind the ſcope of the words, that Text rather ſeems to have ſignified, That by the old way of Works there was no entrance into Paradiſe; for this Sword is ſaid to be *placed to keep the way of the tree of Life, leaſt man by eating of it ſhould live for ever*; and ſo makes rather againſt Purgatory, that ſeems a part or an Appurtenance of the old way of Works.

But a flaming Sword ſeemed a good Weapon, and they were willing to take it into their hands: and indeed their great Argument for all their peculiar Articles, has been *Fire and Sword*.

2 Macc. 12.

But to leave this Sword in the Cherubims hand, let us make a leap to 2 *Maccab.* 12. which is the alone place *Bellarmine* pitches upon in the Old Teſtament, as convincing in this matter; of all others he ſpeaks very ſlightly, however Fathers have made uſe of them, as if they were ſuch, *quæ ſolum probabiliter ſuadent*, and hereabout I ſhall have no controverſie with him, I think he has given them their full due.

Lib. 1. *c.* 3. *de Purg.*

Ibid.

The place then to be conſidered, is 2 *Maccab.* 12. 43, *&c.* where *Judas Maccabæus*, (as *Bellarmine* quotes him) is ſaid to *have gathered twelve thouſand drams of Silver, and ſent them to Jeruſalem, to be laid out in Sacrifices for the dead*; and the gloſs of the Author, he addes, *That it is a pious and a wholſom thought to pray for the dead, that they may be looſed from their ſins.*

Whence he inferres, 1. That the dead may be looſed from their ſins, and

and therefore there is a Purgatory: 2. That Prayers and Sacrifices doe profit the dead. Three other Inferences he draws, the least of which is, That Purgatory and Prayers for the dead must needs be an Article of Faith.

This text is their *Hercules* Club, that knocks all dead: other texts render it but probable, this it seems makes it clear and necessary to be believed, that there is a Purgatory.

Anſ. To this we reply a great many things.

1. As to the matter of fact that is recorded of *Judas*, that he did raiſe a certain ſumme of money (though not 12000, but 200 drams, as the Greek Copy reads it) and ſent it to *Jeruſalem* to buy Sacrifices, I will not diſpute againſt it, he might doe it, probably did it, and in his circumſtances had good reaſon for it; but that he did it *pro mortuis*, or for the Relief of the Dead, that is *Bellarmines* forgery: the text ſayes onely, *pro peccato*, *for the ſin*, viz. leſt being a notorious ſin, the Living ſhould be plagued for it; and that this was his caſe, appears by *v.* 42. *They prayed that the ſin might be blotted out, and Judas exhorted the multitude to keep themſelves ἀναμαρτήτους free from the ſin, ſeeing the puniſhment of them that had committed it*; and this is an Interpretation of his fact, that agrees to the letter of the Text, and the Analogy of Faith.

2. As for the Authors gloſs (*what a piece of piety it is to pray for the dead*) we are not much concerned in it; for whoever was the Author of it, whether *Jaſon* or his Abbreviator, (as may ſeem 2 *Maccab.* 2. 24.) and however good an Hiſtorian he was, we own him for no Prophet; nor did the Church of the *Jews* ever look upon his Writings as Canonical, as Papiſts themſelves confeſs; though *Bellarmine* ſayes the Chriſtian Church did, he gives ſlender proof of it: *Auſtin* indeed ſayes, *It was received of the Church not unprofitably, provided it was ſoberly read*; where he ſeems to caution againſt ſome dangerous paſſages in it, by which unwary Readers might be prejudiced, as much as the more wiſe profited. Bell. *de Purg. lib.* 1. *c.* 3.

But the Author himſelf acquits us from any veneration of him, by his courting his Readers favour ever and anon, and deſires their pardon at leaſt, if any thing had been ſaid amiſs, which are condeſcenſions below the Spirit of God, or any Author inſpired by it. 2 Macc. 2. 26. 2 Macc. 2. 26.

3. if this Author had been good, and the *Jews* there had prayed for the Dead, the Papiſts Inference of Purgatory, according to their own principles is weak: For it ſeems alſo by their Faith, that people may be prayed out of Hell; though this they will not grant for ordinary, leſt it ſhould ſpoyl their Purgatory; yet two Inſtances they very confidently give of it, which ſpeaks a poſſibility: One of *Trajan* a bloody perſecutor, upon the Prayers of *Gregory*; of which *Damaſcen* ſayes, the whole Eaſt and Weſt were witneſſes: And the other of *Falconilla* a Pagan Woman, by the prayers of St. *Thecla*. And if there was need of any

any more ſuch ſtuff, the Scull of a certain Gentile Prieſt told *Macarius*, that its owner was delivered out of Hell by his Prayers; and here is as good Authority, as our Adverſaries will bring by and by for their Purgatory: Though I muſt confeſs, theſe Inſtances, as going againſt the hair, do not over-cleaverly go down; for though they hugely advance Prayer, they quite race Purgatory; to make up therefore differences between the combatants on each party, *Aquinas* tells us, (and he ſeems to moderate well, like an Angelical Doctor,) *That they were not finally ſent to Hell, but according to their preſent merit; and that probably they were firſt raiſed to life, and ſo repented ere they were tranſlated to Heaven, and alſo that this was not by common Law, but ſpecial privi-ledge*, an Act as it were of *Chancery*. But however it was, if one late Penitent, though but one, is thought ſufficient to prevent every ones deſpair, two ſuch inſtances of damned perſons recovered to grace, are ground enough to encourage Prayer for all the reſt.

Suppl. qu. 71. art. 5.

And if Fathers would make theſe fantaſtick arguments Authentick, it was eaſie to give many that ſpeak probably, as if they half believed ſuch a thing, as the poſſibility of a deliverance from Hell. *Origen* goes a great way beyond us; let us hear what *Auſtin* ſayes, that they would make their great man for Purgatory; *Aquinas* denyes not, but that it was his ſaying, *That Suffrages did profit the dead either for a full abſolution, or more tolerable damnation:* Both which muſt referre to their ſtate in Hell; there is no proper Damnation in Purgatory, and Remiſſion is ſaid to be granted before they go to Purgatory; onely an imaginary guilt remains there, that may be properly enough purged in an imaginary place, by an imaginary Fire, ſuch as (for ought we yet hear of Purgatory) that ſeems to be.

Sup. qu. 71. art. 5.

And thus I conceive the force of this Text is fully enervated, the fact being ſhewen to have been miſconſtrued, the gloſs not duely authorized, and the Inference not firmly grounded.

We muſt now paſs into the New Teſtament, and there the moſt likely Texts ſeem to be *Math.* 12. 22. where it is ſaid of the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, *that it ſhall never be forgiven, neither in this World, nor that which is to come*; hence conclude they, that ſome ſins are forgiven in the other world, and therefore a Purgatory.

Math. 12. 22.

Anſ. 1. I deny the Conſequence, for according to their Opinion; as you have foreheard, Purgatory is for perſons whoſe ſins are already *forgiven.*

2. The Original is, οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, *neither in this Age, nor the Age to come*; where the preſent Age may ſignifie the *Judaick ſtate*, wherein Grace was ſtreighter; and the future that of Chriſts Kingdom, wherein it was expected larger. Thus *age to come* is often took, as probably *Heb.* 6. 5. and according to ſome readings, *Iſa.* 9. 6. Chriſt is called inſtead of *everlaſting Father*, πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, *the Father of the Age to come.*

But

But if this will not be admitted,

3. Let *Matthew* interpret himſelf by what he ſayes in the former verſe, where he tells them without this Exaggeration, that it *ſhall not be forgiven*; and to omit Fathers, let me only referre them to his *Brother Mark*, Mark 3. 29. where it is ſimply rendred, *that he hath never forgiveneſs*, but is *in danger of*, or obnoxious to *Eternal Damnation*, οὐκ ἄφεσιν εἰς ἔχει τὸν αἰῶνα. both the former Ages are here wrapt up in the one of Eternity, as it were to correct the Popiſh nicety.

Another Text they make uſe of, is *Mat.* 5. 25, 26. where we are adviſed, *to agree with our adverſary quickly, while in the way, leſt the Adverſary deliver us to the Judge, and the Judge to the Officer, and we be caſt into Priſon, for we ſhall by no means come out thence, till we have payd the utmoſt farthing.* Mat. 5. 25, 26.

Here alſo Papiſts do ſee, Venial ſins in the Farthings, Humane Satisfactions in the Pay, Purgatory in the Priſon.

But that no ſuch things can with any Congruity be hence inferred, you may obſerve,

1. That it is queſtionable, whether this is any Parable, or looks any further than the Civil differences between us and our Brother, which we ſhould ſpeedily take up among our ſelves, by the common Rule of Equity, and not ſuffer needleſly to come before the forenſick Judges, where we may expect utmoſt ſeverity; the Context inclines to this, and ſo this Text is expounded by *Chryſoſtom*, *Theophylact* and *Hierom*.

2. If a Parable; on that account, by the common Rule of the Schools it is not Argumentative, eſpecially in an Article of Faith.

3. Its Scope muſt be intended, and not every particular word wracked, and that ſeems to be only this, That we ſhould make our Peace with God in this Life, and as ſoon as we can, in that here we may expect Mercy; whereas, if we put off matters till we come before Gods Tribunal, we ſhall be dealt with in all ſeverity, God will not abate us an Ace then, he will exact the utmoſt farthing; he will not then hear of Remiſſion, or Compoſition, that we are like to go to eternal perdition; the Priſon is Hell, and there is no relief from the [*untill*;] for the impoſſibility of the Condition makes that but a bare Suppoſition, and it is all one with *never*: as to which Reſolution of the matter, we have Abettors, ſome of the moſt conſiderable of the Popiſh Doctors, *Maldon. in loc. Tolet. in Luc.* 12. *Janſen. Concord. Evang.*

A further Text *Bellarmine* layes great ſtreſs upon, is 1 *Cor.* 15. 29. *What ſhall they doe that are baptized for the dead? if the dead riſe not at all, why are they then baptized for the dead.* 1 Cor. 15. 29.

This we muſt confeſs is a difficult place indeed, and has wreſted many great wits; but Papiſts think, that by way of requital as it were, they may wreſt it, and by *Baptiſme* underſtand all their voluntary ſervices for the dead, ſuppoſing hence that they may thereby profit the dead, and

conſequently, that there is a Purgatory, wherein they are detained, till by theſe means they are relieved.

Anſ. 1. Their Notion of Baptiſm is perfectly new coyned, for though Afflictions which in the Old Teſtament are frequently ſet out by Waters, are ſometimes in the Goſpel couched under this Name of *Baptiſm*, *Mat.* 20. 22. yet Prayers, Alms, Sacrifices, and ſuch like voluntary ſervices were never ſo expreſſed, nor with any pretence of Reaſon can be thereby underſtood.

2. If this was granted, Purgatory could not be hence inferred, for this Baptiſm whatever it was, referred to the Reſurrection of the *Body*, as a typical repreſentation of that, whereon it is made uſe of, for Confirmation of the Faith of that; whereas Purgatory according to them is onely for the Relief of the *Soul*; that were we wholly at a loſs for the poſitive meaning of the Text, or ſhould we be out in our gueſs at it, they could reaſonably take no advantage of it; for to whatever it ſerves, it ſerves not to their purpoſe, the Body and its Reſurrection, and not the Soul and its Purgation being concerned in it, as by the Context clearly appears.

But however, to take Occaſion to explain that very puzzling Text:

1. Some referre it to a corrupt Cuſtom took up by the *Cerinthians* and *Marcionites*, of Baptizing a living perſon inſtead of his Friend which was dead, which *Paul* makes uſe of to their Conviction, without his own approbation. Let this have what weight it will with others, I muſt profeſs it little ſwayes with me.

2. Others think this Baptiſm referres to the waſhings that were uſed about the dead, which ſhewed hope of their Reſurrection, otherwiſe why ſhould they make ſuch a doe about the Bodies of them: Of this Cuſtom we hear ſomething *Acts* 9. 37. but then we muſt take Baptiſm here in the middle Voyce, and read the Text, *Why do they baptize, or uſe Waſhings about the dead.* Let this Notion go as far as it will, I know no hurt in it.

3. According to others, Baptiſm may be here took for Sufferings, and ſo this Clauſe may be much the ſame with what follows in the next Verſe, *Why ſtand we in jeopardy?* Why do we thus expoſe our Bodies, if they ſhall never be reſtored to Life?

Let me adde a Fourth Notion, that takes Baptiſm in a literal Sence, and ſuppoſes an Ordinary Figure of one Number for another, where there is ſpeech of the dead; and that the meaning is, If the Dead riſe not, what ſhall become of us and our Baptiſm, that are baptized into *Jeſus* who is dead, for *if the dead riſe not*, as he there ſayes, *Chriſt is not riſen*, and conſequently our Goſpel and *hope is vain*; and thus by a ſmall diſpenſation with Grammar, which the Apoſtle does not exactly tye himſelf to, we have a plain and ſafe meaning of this difficult Text; however in regard of its difficulty, I ſhould judge it very improper, to make it the Baſis of any new uncouth Article; I would rather uſe it for confirmation

firmation of one that was otherwise sufficiently bottomed, and would keep to the Apostles scope in the Application of it, till I had its fuller and surer interpretation; and that certainly is, to confirm us from something in use among us, of the future Resurrection.

The last Text I shall mention, that is of any probability, is 1 *Pet.* 3. 19. where Christ is said *by the Spirit to have gone and preached to the Spirits in Prison, that were sometimes disobedient in the dayes of Noah.* 1 Pet. 3. 19.

This Prison they dream is Purgatory, and it seems that there is preaching in it too, but to what purpose, if there be no repenting or changing of Estate, as every where Papists confess there is not in Purgatory? and I suppose while the Scripture speaks of the so great wickedness of the world before the Flood, they will not think that the men of that Age went generally to Purgatory, and therefore Christ might have had but few Auditors, if he had gone thither to have preached to them.

The plain meaning of that Text is, that Christ by his Spirit in *Noah* did once preach unto that Generation, whose Spirits are now in hold as Criminals for their then disobedience, of which preaching of *Noah*, and the strivings of this Spirit, we hear, 2 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Gen.* 6. 3.

But to suppose Christs personal going into those dark Regions, to preach the Gospel to Spirits so long departed, is a ridiculous Fable, and destructive even of their own Notion of Purgatory; that reckons the present Life the Way, the Race, and that hereafter is no opportunity to obtain Grace, but satisfie Justice.

Such shifts then they are put to, that right or wrong will take upon them to defend a bad cause; and yet as little as these Scriptures I have quoted make for them, and as much as in truth they make against them, they are their chief Weapons: If I should mention several others, I could propose no other design than to shame them; but it may be they will say, Doe that if I can; I shall however forbear, in that it may be an harder task than I am aware, for some folks have Whores Foreheads, and will not be ashamed.

(4) Let us now *briefly consider their Supplementary Arguments*; which ordinarily are from these heads.

1. *Reasons.*
2. *Fathers.*
3. *Councils.*
4. *Consent of Nations.*
5. *Revelations.*

I. Let us hear their strong *Reasons* for a Purgatory, and the first I find to be this: *Reasons.*

First, *In that some sins are Venial, and onely worthy of a temporal Punishment, and it is possible a man may depart out of this Life onely with* Bell. *de Purg.* c. 11. l. 1.

theſe, Therefore it is neceſſary that they ſhould be purged, and expiated in another.

Reaſon. Secondly, *When Sinners are reconciled to God, the whole Temporal Puniſhment is not alwayes remitted with the Sin, and a man may die before he has diſcharged it, and therefore in the other World he muſt make it up*; and hereon a Purgatory ſeems neceſſary.

And theſe are all the Reaſons *Bellarmine* gives us, but adde what I ſhall conſider under the following diſtinct heads; and by this you'l ſee upon what lame legges this great Doctrine ſtands: For,

1. We utterly deny any Sin, to be in this ſence *Venial*, having learn'd out of the Scriptures, that *the wages of ſin*, one as well as another, *is death*, *Rom.* 6. 23.

2. Though we allow of Fatherly Chaſtiſements that God layes on his people here, for others example, and their own amendment, as a fruit of Love rather than Juſtice; we underſtand nothing of a proper puniſhment by way of *perſonal* Satisfaction that is required of us, when God has pardoned us; having learnt, that *God does Abundantly pardon where he pardons*, *Iſa.* 55. 7. and having confidence that Chriſt has fully ſatisfied, where he has undertook to ſatisfie, *by one Sacrifice Perfecting for Ever them that are ſanctified*, *Heb.* 10. 4. and that *there is No condemnation to them that are in Chriſt*, *Rom.* 8. 1. And we reckon it abſurd, that we ſhould be looſed in reſpect of our Greater ſins, by the ſufferings of another, and held for our ſlighter Peccadillo's to make ſatisfaction in our own perſons; we cannot conceive why Chriſt that payd the *pounds*, ſhould grudge the *pence*; after he has payd our Debt, he ſhould ſuffer us to lye for Fees. If there was a meetneſs we ſhould ſmart for any of our ſins, one would expect it rather for our *great ones*; but the Goodneſs that paſſes over them, will not diſparage it ſelf to take notice of *little* things; but we aſſure our ſelves where it ſets on Forgiveneſs, it will make clear work, *forgiving iniquity*, *tranſgreſſion and ſin*, that all Glory may be to God. Rev. 3. 19.

3. We ſuppoſe the wiſe Providence of God do's ſo far ſubſerve his Covenant, that no ſurprizal ſhall happen to them intereſted in it, to cut them ſhort of the full benefit of it, and that God will continue them in this Life, till he has fitted them for a better; otherwiſe *David* was out in his Notion of Gods Covenant, that reckoned it *ordered in all Things and ſure*, 2 *Sam.* 23. 5. and we are abuſed in what we hear of his exact and accurate Providence, *Matth.* 10. 29, 30. If this be all *Bellarmines* Reaſon for a Purgatory, to catch thoſe of God's people that ſhall drop out of his providential hand, that they may not quite fall into Hell, he may content himſelf, God is not ſo careleſs of his own matters, or People, as he would make him; his Fruit drops not off the Tree of its own accord, that there ſhould be danger of its falling before it was ripe; but he gathers it in convenient ſeaſon, ſo that there is no need of a Purgatory, wherein it ſhould lye mellowing. You ſee by what we have

replyed

replyed in these three particulars, how straightened they are for Reasons, that they must extenuate the Desert of Sin, lessen the Merit of Christ, and reflect on the wise Providence of God, to have any shew of one; and I must profess, had I hæsitated at the Doctrine of *Purgatory* before, such Reasons as these for it, would have confirmed me in the disbelief of it; *'Tis time to desert that Faith, where I cannot be a Believer, without being also a Blasphemer.*

II. Their Second Argument is from *Fathers*: As to which I briefly reply, that upon Examination I find some false Fathers imposed, others sallly quoted, others sallly applyed to what they never intended, as was easie to give instances, were they not from other hands so abundantly ministred. Fathers.

And further I find, (as is said of a certain people) that they sell powder to Friend and Foe, whereby a great noyse is made, and a great smoak is raised, in which a man may soon lose his Religion, but I pity the poor man that is to seek it among them.

And herein I acknowledge God very good to his Church, discouraging her by this Humane uncertainty from pinning her Faith on Man, and directing her to his infallible Word, on which alone she can safely and reasonably settle; and such an Observation I conceive put the Spouse on that particular Inquisition after Christ himself, *Cant.* 1. 7. *Tell me, (O thou whom my Soul loveth,) where thou feedest, where thou makest thy flock to rest at Noon; for why should I be as one that turneth aside* (or sitteth Vailed after the manner of Harlots) *by the flocks of thy Companions?* That Church that would keep it self chaste, must be aware of wanton Shepheards, how it sits down by them, or dallyes with them, and keep close to Christ, that it may be delivered from them; and that Church or Society of men is a Strumpet, that draws a Veyl over its own Eyes, not caring to distinguish between Christ and his Companions; that listens to every ones Voyce, and receives every ones Embrace; *Christs sheep know his Voyce, and follow him, and a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the Voyce of strangers, Joh.* 10. 4, 5. And a Stranger he is, and a strange voyce he has, that speaks not according to what is written, and so he should be looked on by you, *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8, 9.

I speak not this to disparage the true Fathers, but I fear, as by the body of *Moses*, (if he could have found it, or *Michael* would have delivered it,) the Devil had a design of imposing upon *Israel*; so under the name of divers upright and eminent Fathers, the Deceiver of the Nations, and his Prophets, have obtruded upon the World many gross Superstitions and corrupt Doctrines, whereof it is but needfull we should take caution, especially if there appears to us the Ghost of an ancient Father, long dead, and hid from former Ages, and raised by we know not what Inchantments of later Impostors, speaking things dissonant to the Analogy of Faith; as is the case in respect of divers of those Fathers the Papists Deut. 34. 6. Jud. 9.

urge

urge us with, as *Dyoniſius*, *Clemens*, *Ephrem*, &c. But univerſally it is a good Rule, to beware of Men, and have your eye to the Word of God, *which is able to inſtruct you to every good work.*

2 Tim. 3. 17.

Councils.

III. They pretend alſo *Councils* in the Caſe.

To which pretence I reply, that we find none of Antiquity or Univerſality to move us in the matter; nor for ought appears, was it ever induſtriouſly handled till the Council of *Florence*, not much upward of two hundred years, as *Bellarmine* himſelf ſeems to grant; on occaſion of Pope *John* the 22th. being impeached of Hereſie, as believing the ſleep of all Souls till the general Reſurrection, he plainly tells us, that he *believed ſo, while it was lawfull for him ſo to doe without danger of Hereſie, for the Church had not then defined what in that caſe was to be believed.* And conſequently the diviſion of our dead Saints into thoſe in Heaven and in Purgatory, even according to him, was not determined in any antecedent Council; and we are not moved by an *Article of Faith* that is ſo novel; our Creed was compleated 1600 years ſince, whereas it ſeems this great Article of Purgatory is not of 300 years ſtanding; for before then we might ſafely have believed all Souls quiet enough. And the truth of it is, this Opinion did prevail, *as an Opinion*, among ſeveral of the Ancients, and was probably the true foundation of thoſe Footſteps of Superſtition that we find among them in reference to the Dead; yet though this Foundation by the Popiſh Church it ſelf is raced, the Popiſh *purgatory*, upon the Superſtructure of ſtraw that the Ancients laid thereon, is principally founded; as in all their Treatiſes of that Subject may be obſerved.

Bell. *de Rom. Pont. lib.* 4. *c.* 14.

Conſent of Nations.

IV. The Fourth Argument is, from general *Conſent of Nations*; and here *Bellarmine* reckons up the *Hebrews*, the *Mahumetans*, and the *Heathens*.

Lib. 4. *de purg. c.* 11.

I had expected he would have brought in the *Greeks* alſo; and it may be ſuppoſed he took that for granted, in regard he had quoted ſo many of the *Greek* Fathers in the former Chapter, that *for ought I perceive ſpake good Greek*, if that would end a controverſie; or however, ſay our *Neotericks*, the *Greeks* differed in this point heretofore, they agreed to it in the Council of *Florence*; where the *Greek Emperour* Paleologus, *and* Joſeph *the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *with divers Greek Biſhops were preſent, and gave their conſent in the diſputed point of Purgatory.*

In anſwer to this, I reply only two things, (for I am loth to loſe the *Greeks*, I muſt confeſs, being ſo conſiderable a Body of Chriſtians.)

1. That *Bellarmine* does yield the *Greeks* to be ſuſpected at leaſt of Hereſie in this buſineſs, and the *Armenians* alſo, and brings in *Aquinas* as of his mind; and yet further feeds his ſuſpition from the proceeding of the very Council of *Florence*, whence later Writers would perſwade us of their being right for the buſineſs.

De purg lib. 1. *c.* 2.

2. Whatever was done by the *Greek* Biſhops in that Synod, the reſt of

of the *Greek* Churches disowned when they came home, and interdicted them all Christian Burial for their pains; and a fatal Council this is noted every way to have been to the *Greeks*, for in it the Patriarch dyes, presently after the Emperour, and within fourteen years after, *Constantinople* is took by the *Turks*, the Emperours Brother slain, the *Greek* Empire dissolved, the Christians of those parts inslaved, and gave thereby to find *their Purgatory* in this world. *Symson.*

As to their pretension to the *Hebrews* as being for Purgatory, they have shewed their proof, 2 *Mac.* and it is needless further to disprove them.

For the *Heathen*, especially the Poets, I think we may grant several of them, as Abetters, and I suppose *Fathers* of this profound Notion.

As to the *Mahumetans* also I will not much dispute, nor wonder if I find Purgatory in their *Alcoran*, since *Sergius* the Monk was one of the Authors of it.

And on recollection of the whole, this specious Argument of *Consent of Nations* results, in the sweet Harmony of *Turks*, *Papists*, and Heathen Poets; and like enough, if we would trace them, they agree in more points than this, and herein let them glory on, while we comfort our selves in our *redemption from our vain Conversation received by Tradition from our Fathers.* 1 Pet. 1. 18.

V. The Fifth and last Argument is from *Apparitions*; and here I might tell you abundance of pretty storyes, were it worth the while. Apparitions.

But as to these I must frankly say, that if they had been true, (whereas the generality of them smell of fiction,) and if there had been ten, where we hear onely of one, it would have made this Doctrine more suspicious; it seems hereby the interest of Hell to promote such Fancies; These Phantasms, Ghosts, or what else you will call them, were never, as I find, *allowed Preachers*, nor do any of the Monks record that they shewed them their *Orders*, and it is observable, they came with different stories, some describing a Popish Purgatory, and others as it were a *Turkish* Paradise; but God has directed us to *Moses and the Prophets*, and upbraided *inquiring for the Living, of the Dead.* So that I look on all of this Nature as diabolical Delusion, and the heeding of such things as a great declension from God, and the very precipice unto all superstition. And now let Papists further brag, that they have not onely *Turks and Heathens, but even Hell it self of their mind.* Luk. 16. 29. Isa. 8. 19.

But we have followed them too far in their Fopperies, let us briefly inquire,

(5) *What ground there is from Scripture to disbelieve any such thing as Purgatory?*

1. The Scriptures mention onely a two-fold State of Persons departed this Life, placing some in Heaven, and others in Hell; and accordingly allure the Good by the Hopes of one, and fright the Bad with the Scripture Grounds to believe no Purgatory.

Threats

Threats of the other, never ſetting before us for Encouragement or Diſcouragement any Third ſtate after this Life; *Mar.* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not, ſhall be damned*: and leaſt Sophiſters ſhould except, that he ſayes not he ſhall *preſently* be ſaved, but by the intermediation of Purgatory, we find it elſewhere, even in words of the *preſent* expreſſed, *Joh.* 3. 36. *He that believeth on the Son, hath everlaſting Life*; and on the contrary, *the wrath of God is ſaid to abide on him that doth not.*

2. The Scripture makes onely a two-fold diviſion of Saints, in reſpect of *place*, dividing the *whole Family* into them *on Earth*, and *them in Heaven*, *Eph.* 3. 15. Therefore none that are under his Fatherly Love and Care, can well be ſuppoſed elſewhere.

3. The Saints that undoubtedly knew the mind of God, have not onely been aſſured themſelves, but have aſſured one another, that on their bodily death, they ſhould goe forthwith to Bliſs: whence is that, *to me to dye is gain, I deſire to depart, and to be with Chriſt*, *Phil.* 1. 21. And agen, 2 *Cor.* 5. 8. *We are confident I ſay, and willing rather to be abſent from the Body, and preſent with the Lord*; ſo the converted Thief expected and was aſſured, (when he had no time to make perſonal ſatisfaction, as the Papiſts require) *This day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe*, not Purgatory; there to be ſure Chriſt is not; and where he is, there you may all along obſerve, they expect to be, and that immediately; *Lazarus* is no ſooner dead, but he is ſeen in *Abrahams* boſom, which ſure was a place of Reſt; and in general, they are pronounced *bleſſed that dye in the Lord, as reſting from their labours*, *Rev.* 14. 13. And leſt this ſhould be reſtrained to Martyrs, and the former to eminent Saints, (*ſuch as the Thief for inſtance*) we hear it, that good men, without exception, *are taken hence* in pity, that they may be *freed from preſent evil*, and go to reſt after their hard labours; which certainly implyes not, their being caſt into Purgatory-fire, if it be ſo fierce eſpecially, as it is painted.

Iſa. 57. 1, 2.

4. The Scripture ſpeaks of Chriſt as having fully ſatisfied, and of Believers as being intirely ſanctified, and thereon at peace with God, and as rejoycing in hope of the Glory of God, looking on all the Afflictions that remains flea-bitings, little momentany things, which they would not certainly have ſpoke ſo contemptibly of, if they had thought they might have layn ſome thouſand years in Purgatory-flames: No, they reckoned onely *of the Sufferings of the preſent time*, not dreaming of any afterwards, but on their *Juſtification by Faith* concluded *of their Peace with God.* And agen, they are ſpoken of *Joying in God through their Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom they had* Now *received the Attonement*; they did certainly expect that God had no after-reckoning for them; their *ſmiling look* on God, ſpoke evidently they thought not of further Severities from him.

Rom. 8. 18. Rom. 5. 1. *V.* 11.

5. The Scripture ſpeaks of God as *throughly* pardoning upon our repenting;

repenting; *Ezek.* 18. 22. *All his Tranſgreſſions that he hath committed, they ſhall not be mentioned unto him.* Heb. 8. 12. *I will be merciful unto their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſins and iniquities I will remember no more*; whereas he would remember them with a witneſs, if he ſhould throw them into that dark Priſon, till they had made in their own perſons an Expiation, by ſuch ſufferings as are not to be parallel'd on Earth.

6. The Scripture ſpeaks expreſly of this Life as our Way and onely working-time, and that *in the night* of Death *no man can work*; and moreover, *that every man ſhall receive according to what he hath done in the Body*, 2 Cor. 5. 10. *He* and not another, *Done* and not ſuffered; *in the Body*, while Soul and Body were together, and not what the Soul ſhould doe apart; and indeed, what is done out of the Body, is not the act of the man, and ſo can tend neither to his good or hurt, and conſequently, what the *Soul* is ſuppoſed to ſuffer in Purgatory, can no wayes be imagined Expiatory for what was done in the Body, as Papiſts themſelves in effect grant, (in denying that there is any Merit) and thereby yield their Purgatory a fantaſtical and inſignificant thing. Joh. 9. 4.

7. And laſtly, if there was ſuch a diſtreſs incident to the Souls of Believers after death, no doubt but God would have appointed ſomething for their relief; but no Sacrifice do we find under the Law that referres to the dead, or any one Office appointed or performed by any Ancient Saint under that diſpenſation, that can probably be applyed to ſuch a purpoſe; whereas every Minute caſe was reſpected, and from All uncleanneſs care was taken we might be purged; but the Dead, God ſeems willing ſhould be deſerted, not only by his paſſing them over, but charging us, as it were, to make as little adoe as may be about them, we *defile our* ſelves *by touching of them*, and are diſcharged thoſe pœnances that natural Superſtition had ingaged the Nations in, in reference to them: *Deut.* 14. 1. *You ſhall not cut your ſelves, nor make any baldneſs between your eyes for the dead*; and to the ſame purpoſe more fully, *Lev.* 19. 27, 28. This care we find taken to prevent much Ceremonie, ſuch eſpecially as carryed a ſhew of ſeverity, and ſeemed likelyeſt (according to the Popiſh Notion) to have profited the dead; but nothing in its ſtead does appear inſtituted for their relief; *which ſilence ſpeaks*, That perſons removed into the other world, are either happy above our Help, or miſerable beyond it: The Seventh day under the Law, was the day that perfected their cleanſing, and what was not clean then, we hear not when it ſhould be clean; by which probably was typified, that the time of Life was the time of Hope, and what was neglected in that term, was not to be repaired unto Eternity. Numb. 19. 12.

Thus much for Scriptural Arguments againſt this Doctrine of Purgatory.

But I foreſee a ſhrewd Cavil, which yet I am aſhamed to concern my ſelf about, it has ſo little in it; but on the ſame account I might have let all alone. Let us then hear it: Why,

Cavil. We have brought never a poſitive Scripture, that ſayes, There is no ſuch place as *Purgatory*; and an huge Out-cry is on ſuch Occaſions taken up againſt our *Negative* way of arguing againſt a Doctrine that they *poſitively profeſs*.

E. W. *Prot. without principles*, P. 459.

Anſ. 1. This old Father had ſaid ſomething, if he had told us, they had *poſitively proved* it; but *poſitive Profeſſion* without proof (methinks) ſhould not priviledge any one from anothers *as-poſitive Negation*, if I may ſo phraſe it. And truely on their part it lyes to have given us poſitive and expreſs Scripture for Purgatory, that would impoſe it on us as a poſitive Article of Faith to be believed on pain of Damnation, which how they have quitted themſelves in, may be obſerved in the obſcure and impertinent Allegations before inſtanced in.

2. It ſeems abundantly ſufficient for a *ſuſpenſion of Faith*, (which is our caſe,) that we ſee, and are able to ſhew, that there is *no* Foundation for it, which is that I think he calls our *Negative way of Arguing*.

3. It ſeems abſurd to provoke to poſitive expreſs Scripture againſt every particular Chimæra that may come into mens heads, a thouſand years after the Scriptures were writ; for ſo, if any man ſhould aſſert, (eſpecially if many ſhould agree to it) that *Mahomet* is a true Prophet, or that the Moon was a Milſtone, or whatever elſe can be ſuppoſed more unlikely; I am bound to ſubſcribe to it, except I can bring particular, poſitive, expreſs Scripture againſt it. It has alwayes been the prudence of Law-givers to direct their particular Laws againſt Faults in being, leſt in forbidding all that might be, they might teach ſome, that never elſe would have been; God has walked in the ſame wiſdom he infuſed into them, and it has ſufficed him particularly to condemn what was particularly practiſed againſt Faith and good Manners, leaving general Rules for the Tryal of after Emergencies. Yet,

4. In the Scriptures we have quoted, there is that poſitively aſſerted, that gives us good Foundation poſitively to conclude, that there is no ſuch place as *Purgatory*.

For if Chriſt has fully ſatisfied, and God fully pardoned, and gave hopes to his people, that on their departure hence, they ſhall be immediately glorified, (all which has been fully by poſitive Scriptures proved) we may poſitively conclude, that other Satisfactions are not required, the Saints ſhall not be ſo ſeverely puniſhed, nor their Expectations at that rate delayed, as in the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is aſſerted. And thus we have done with our *Doctrine poſitive*.

Evil Conſequences of the Doctrine of Purgatory.

(6) *What evil Conſequences are there of this Doctrine of Purgatory, where it is received, and whereon it ſhould not be received?*

I have forehinted ſome, which I ſhall briefly recapitulate, and adde a few others.

1. Hereby the Freeneſs of Gods Grace is diſparaged, and he is repreſented an hard Maſter to them that fear him, contrary to the Notion he has

has every where given them of himself, and his design of insinuating into the good Opinion of them, as one mainly tender over them: God would make them believe, that *he was afflicted in all their Afflictions*, and angry with them that layd an hard blow, or continued an heavy hand upon them, though it was but for seventy years. But in this Doctrine of *Purgatory* he is represented as of a far other temper; and that when men have done their worst with them, they shall not scape so, but hee'll have his pennyworths out of them, and a thousand years exquisite Torments shall not suffice some of them; which is to dash the good Opinion his Saints (on his Sons Report) had conceived of him. Zech. 1. 15.

2. Hereby the Fulness of Christs satisfaction is denyed, and Faith in him much discouraged. What confidence indeed can be put in him, if he should leave us thus in the lurch, and force us to seek other Friends, when we have most need of him.

3. Hereby the horrid Nature of Sin is lessened, in that any thing that we can suffer in a little time, or our Friends can doe over and above their own Duty, is reputed a just satisfaction for it, or any the least Remainders of it.

4. Hereon Humane works and helps are over advanced, and many a piece of Superstition and Will-worship introduced, and a pack of deceitfull Priests diverted from their proper work with the Living, and vainly occupyed about the Dead, that have no more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the Sun. Eccl. 9. 6.

5. Hence Bad men are less carefull to prepare for Death, since a great part of their business may be done by other hands when they are gone.

6. Hereon Good men are e'en afraid to dye, for it seems a terrible thing to enter into this *Purgatory*, where especially their coming out depends so much on mans Sincerity, whom it is hard to trust when one is gone, and *his* Reward is come. They that know the difficulty of Believing in Christ, must needs be more streightened to place any comfortable confidence in a Priests prayers and Masses, that (if he be faithfull while he live,) lives not for ever to make Intercession, or make up his Satisfaction for him.

From all which I conclude,

That the Doctrine of Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead, as if thereby their afflicted, tormented Souls could be relieved, is a Corruption of lamentable consequence to the Church, and a pernitious snare to Souls. General Conclusion.

But since there is no such Thing as a Purgatory after this Life,

1. Let us purge and prepare our selves as much as we can in this Life, making use of Christs Blood, Spirit and Word to that purpose; and freely submitting to, and complying with present Afflictions in their design this way, considering, That *Christ gave himself for us, that he* *Use.*

might redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie unto himſelf a peculiar people zealous of good works. Let the fire of holy zeal burn in your breaſts, ſince the Fire of an after-Purgatory, is not like to kindle on your perſons.

2. Let this cut off all vain hopes after death from them that have neglected Salvation-work in life, conſidering that there is no relief for them hereafter, but to Hell God will immediately ſend them, *Pſal.* 9. 17. *Conſider this ye that forget God,* and unpreparedly expoſe your ſelves to his hand, for he will *tear you in pieces, and there ſhall be none to deliver you*; or yet further to ſpeak to you in the *Pſalmiſts* words, *Pſ.* 49. 6,7,8. *They that truſt in their wealth, and boaſt themſelves in the multitude of their Riches, none of them can by any means redeem his Brother, nor give to God a Ranſom for him; For the Redemption of their Soul is precious, and it ceaſeth for ever.*

Pſal. 50. 22.

3. Let this chaſe away needleſs Fears from good people at the point of Death, for when they have drunk that Cup, they ſhall taſte no more bitter to all Eternity, *Sorrow and ſighing ſhall fly away, and everlaſting Joy ſhall be upon their heads.*

4. Let what has been ſaid commend the Proteſtant Doctrine in *denying Purgatory*, as a uſefull wholſome Doctrine, while we live, and alike comfortable to them that have lived well, and learn'd to rely on Chriſt, when they come to dye.

(7) Laſtly, *let me give the genuine ſence of this place, and improve it*, and this will force a more particular reſpect to the Context.

1. The Builders are generally underſtood, (in a way of Eminency at leaſt) of the Doctors of the Church; though I will not contend, if any ſhall comprehend alſo their Diſciples that ſhall *build* their Faith upon the Doctrine which they have delivered.

2. The Foundation that is built on by both Builders is ſuppoſed the ſame, *The Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, ſuch as own him, are as to the main Chriſtian; they on all hands are yielded to broach *damnable doctrines* indeed, *that deny the Lord that bought them*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1.

3. As to the Materials that are ſuperſtructed on this Foundation, though ſome of our Adverſaries are contentious about them, and will (againſt all ſence) ſuppoſe by Gold and Silver to be meant *good Works*, and by Hay and Stubble *Venial* ſins, (which is a perverſion of the very ſcope of the Text) yet hereabout we are pretty generally agreed, that at leaſt *properly and firſtly*, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Doctrines, and by *Gold, Silver, and precious Stones*, are meant a Superſtructure ſuitable to, and worthy of the Foundation, *like precious Faith*, that in the whole Building there may be a proportion: And by Wood, Hay and Stubble, (as *Alapide* phraſes it) we underſtand, *Doctrina incerta, frivola, pompoſa, phalerata, curioſa, inutilis*; an uncertain, frivolous, pompous Doctrine, that has more ſhew than ſubſtance; that is of a baſe, earthy, rotten, moulding, periſhing

In locum.

periſhing Nature, that is a blemiſh to the Foundation, and deſtroys the Uniformity of Chriſtian Religion; and makes a meer *Nebuchadnezzars* Image of it, part Gold, and part Clay; that can never cement or hold long together: And by theſe laſt Builders, or rather Dawbers, I underſtand eminently the *Popiſh* Doctors; Chriſt they ſeem content ſhould lye for the Foundation, though ſome will tell them, it is but a Nominal Chriſt that they lay there neither, for the ſtreſs of their Building is layd on other things, while they make uſe of his Name; and we muſt be beholding to our ſelves, and I know not what Saints, for our Salvation, though He bears the Title of *our Saviour*. Yet grant it, that they make Chriſt their Foundation, what incongruity is there between that and their ſuperſtruction? To inſtance:

Chriſt is *King*; this they pretend to own, a *golden foundation*: But They muſt raign. This in effect they inferre; a wooden, dirty, dungy Superſtruction. If you ask wherein they do ſo? I anſwer, (1) In diſpenſing with Chriſts Laws, which they do at pleaſure. (2) In making New Laws equally obliging Conſcience under pain of Damnation; this they have done with that Arrogance, that we may finde Ten of theirs to One of Chriſts, as will appear by comparing their Voluminous Decretals with his Goſpels, and his Servants Epiſtles. And laſtly, in taking upon them to Authorize as it were and inforce his Laws, as if they had their binding power, not ſo much from Chriſts Inſtitution, as the Popes Declaration: nor in this can they pretend Subſtitution, unleſs they could ſhew us his Commiſſion, walked by his Directions, or expreſſed more Subjection. That Scripture, in regard of the Popes Arrogance, both in reſpect of Chriſt and his People, may well be applyed (as undoubtedly it belongs) to him; that *as God, he ſitteth in the Temple of God, ſhewing himſelf that he is God*, 2 Theſſ. 2. 4. Pſal. 2. 6.

Agen, Chriſt is *Prophet*; a good Foundation: But we muſt ultimately hear and heed the Pope; a ſtrawy ſuperſtruction, and a perfect degrading of Chriſt by implication; ſee whether we bring againſt them a wrongfull accuſation: *Things are not to be believed becauſe Chriſt ſaid them, but becauſe the Church of Rome avouches them*; the very Scriptures themſelves, and every particular Article of Faith, according to them, have their Credibility, not from any character that Chriſt has put upon them, or Seal that he has ſet to them, but as the Church votes them, ſo we muſt believe of them: This is more notorious than that we ſhould need to bring in particular Authors of theirs; and what is the meaning of this, but while they give Chriſt the Name, to uſurp to themſelves the Office of inſtructing and inſightening the world; *it may be no Hereſie to disbelieve what Chriſt has ſaid*, as was fore-noted in the inſtance of Pope *John* 22th; but he that ſuſpends Faith to any thing, or dares think contrary to what the Pope (forſooth) and his Council have inſtamped with their Authority, he is an intolerable Heretick, and fit onely for Hell.

Once

Once more, They will not ſtand with us about Chriſts being *Prieſt*, wherein they ſeem to own the *Foundation*; but ſtreight joyn with him ſuch a frye of their *Sacrificuli*, as if they much doubted his ſufficiency: hence alſo we are taught by them to multiply Sacrifices as well as Prieſts, as if he had not by that one he offered, for ever perfected them that believe; we are put on perſonal Satisfactions, directed to others Interceſſions, all wayes are deviſed to affront him in this Office, while they pretend to own him.

Heb. 10. 14.

And by what in theſe particulars has been inſtanced, is evidenced what it is to rear a ſtrawy Superſtruction on this golden Foundation, wherein the Papiſts of all men are notoriouſly guilty.

4. By the *Day* that ſhall declare every mans work, the Papiſts will have meant, as in their Tranſlation is read, *the Day of the Lord*; by which ſome of them underſtand the Day of the general Judgement; though others will admit a more particular Judgement, and with good Reaſon; for if good and bad works were not declared till the day of the univerſal Jndgement, and the fiery Tribulation of that day, the Fire of Purgatory would go quite out, for there would be no place for that: But it is confeſſed on all hands, that the generality of *Greek* Copyes, read onely *the Day*, not *the Day of the Lord*; and that it is not ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα. as that great Day is wont to be expreſſed, but onely, ἡ ἡμέρα; Therefore hereby I am inclined to underſtand ſome brighter ſeaſon of the Goſpel, and *day*, in reſpect of its Light, to diſtinguiſh it from the former times, which were a kind of Night, wherein thoſe Myſts had aroſe, that the Light and Heat of this Day ſhould ſcatter and chaſe; according as was foretold, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 8. *That this wicked one ſhould be revealed, and that the Lord ſhould conſume him with the Spirit of his Mouth, and deſtroy him with the brightneſs of his coming*; which word we find has been regarded, and that *wicked one* and his Works (however by the advantage of former darkneſs he and they were concealed) have begun to be revealed, conſumed, and we hope, as the day grows brighter, to ſee utterly deſtroyed. For as the Day growes in Light, we may expect it to increaſe in Heat, that it ſhall be tormenting, through its violent ſcorching, to them that for their evil and odious works have alwayes affected darkneſs and ſhade, *Rev.* 16. 8, 9.

5. We are hereby lead further into the underſtanding of the Fire after mentioned, as a Concomitant of this day, wherein every mans work, that is, Words and Faith, ſhould be tryed, all adulterate works conſumed, and ſuch like workers damaged and greatly endangered; and this Fire I underſtand partly of the Word of God, which I find ſo expreſſed, *Jer.* 23. 29. *Is not my Word like Fire?* and ſo acting, *Jer.* 20. 9. *His Word in my heart was as a burning Fire, ſhut up in my Bones*; partly I underſtand it of the Spirit, that ſhall blow up this Word, and actuate it unto a greater vigour, making it to burn fiercer, as Bellowes doe inrage our ordinary fire, to which there ſeems an alluſion, *Iſa.* 30. 33. *the breath*

breath of the Lord like a ſtream of Brimſtone doth kindle it; and in regard of the inflamations that are made in the Heart by the Spirits enforcing the Word, it may be called a *Spirit of Burning*, *Iſa.* 4. 4. And yet further I conceive, great and grievous Tribulations may be a third ingredient of this fire, and all to make it yet fiercer and fiercer, that it may be effective for the various purpoſes for which it is ſent, probation, purgation, or conſumption, according to the pliableneſs or obſtinacy of the Objects it meets with.

When this fire ſhall be kindled, and at this rate quickened, true and falſe Doctrine ſhall be diſtinguiſhed, the one cleared, and the other condemned; and ſo each mans works manifeſted.

This premiſed, what remains is eaſily explained.

His Work may be ſaid to *abide*, whoſe Doctrine ſhall be approved, and *he ſhall receive a reward*; preſent, in the further ſatisfaction of mind he ſhall receive by the Spirits confirmation and conſolation of him, as to what he has preached, profeſſed, or believed; and future, in the peculiar Glory he may expect, as having found Grace to be faithfull in all times: This *John* exhorts the Elect Lady to look to, that both he and ſhe might *receive a full reward*, 2 *John* 8.

7. His Works are ſaid to be burnt, that yields to the burning light of that day, that ſubmits to the Convictions of the Spirit, and quits his former Errours; ſo Chriſt is ſaid to *come to deſtroy the works of the Devil, by the manifeſtation of himſelf*, 1 *Joh.* 3. 8. That is, to burn them, as here, with the brightneſs of his coming; and ſo the Sons of *Levi* were purified, by his burning up their droſs, and leaving them thereby a pure maſs; it is, I'm ſure, no uncouth Notion we give you, when we interpret this burning of their works, by a purification that ſhall paſs upon the Builders, in *their* ſeparation and conſumption, through the Spirits efficacious and clear Conviction. But, Mal. 3. 2, 3.

8. *How is the Builder hereon ſaid to ſuffer loſs?* It may ſeem his Gain.

Anſ. Yea, and it will prove ſo, as Loſſes often doe, even as the Mariner accounts it, when by the loſs of his Lumber he ſaves his Treaſure, by the loſs of his Goods he ſaves his Ship, by the loſs of his Ship he ſaves his Life; But whatever he does gain, Loſs ſtill he is reckoned to ſuſtain. So in the preſent Caſe, he that on the Spirits Conviction quits his former Errours, gets the knowledge of the Truth, gets Favour with God, which are far better things than what he has parted with. Yet inaſmuch as theſe things might have been eaſier and cheaper had, than (it may be) he comes by them, and in that by a kind of force, as in a Fire or Shipwrack, to ſave himſelf he parts with them; they may bear the Name of a Loſs, as *Paul* reckons the parting with his Righteouſneſs, though it was in order to the winning of Chriſt, *Phil.* 3. 7, 8. *Thoſe things that were gain to me, I counted loſs, yea doubtleſs, I count all loſs, I have ſuffered the loſs of all things, &c.*

And

And in the preſent caſe, whenever theſe refuſe-works are burnt, we may reckon up ſome Loſs, as (may be) the loſs of Time, the loſs of Labour, the loſs of Reputation, the loſs of Preferment, the loſs of Life; ſo ſome have found in quitting their corrupt Opinions, but the promiſe is, *He that loſeth his Life for my Name, ſhall find it*, Matth. 10. 39.

9. From hence naturally refults the interpretation of our Text, [*But he himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by Fire,*] that is, by yielding to theſe Convictions, and quitting his falſe Opinions, even as when a mans Houſe is on fire, if he leaves his Goods, leaps out of the Window, and haſtes away, he may ſave his own perſon with the loſs of the Reſt; but if he obſtinately reſiſt the fire, in zeal to ſave his Subſtance, he may periſh himſelf: In like manner, if when this Spiritual Fire do's fall from Heaven upon our ſpiritual Hay and Stubble, we ſuffer it to prey thereupon, and content our ſelves to eſcape with our own Lives, giving up theſe Idols of our Hearts, and inclining our ſelves to embrace Gods Revealed Truths, we may ſave our Souls with ſome little ſcorching. But if we go about to quench this Fire, and ſuppreſs its Light, with reſolution to ſave this pitifull ſtuff; we may poſſibly preſerve that, but more than *hazard* the everlaſting burning of our own Souls by it. *For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven againſt all ungodlineſs and unrighteouſneſs of men, who hold the Truth in unrighteouſneſs; and to them that are contentious, and obey not the Truth, but obey Unrighteouſneſs, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguiſh* will God repay *on every Soul of them.*

Rom. 1. 18.

And this I ſuppoſe is the genuine meaning of the place.

Obj. But our Adverſaries will be asking, What Pope, what Council ſayes ſo? by what Authority will we inforce their receiving of this ſence?

Anſ. To which I anſwer in two particulars:

1. I note the Commentaries of Popes and Councils, however good they be at it, are very rare things, and come not to every ones hands; one may gueſs them choyſe Jewels, that they keep them ſo cloſe; though they are a ſpightfull ſort of Folks, if they onely know the Mind of God, that they ſo rarely apply themſelves to open the Word of God.

2. I ſuppoſe there is *Authority* in the Text ſufficient to bow our Minds to read it with meekneſs, and without prejudice; and being confident of this, I am leſs ſolicitous for the *Authority* of the Comment. For in our giving the ſence of Scripture, we pretend not to have *dominion* over any ones Faith, that we ſhould come with Serjeants and Bailiffs to arreſt any ones conſent without his due conviction to it; but it ſuffices us to propoſe with Fidelity, what on our beſt ſearch and moſt ſerious prayer, ſeems likelyeſt to be the mind of God, and commend our ſelves and ſence to *every mans Conſcience in the ſight of God*; and he that hath an Eye to ſee, let him ſee; but he that will flutter out all the light that is

brought

brought to him, because it is not set on a Candle-stick that likes him, let him lie in darkness, if he affects it; but let him think of the blackness of darkness that may be reserved for him, as a just punishment of his despight of Light. This has been thought a meet Recompence for such Errour. *Soc. de dæm. & mundo.*

Briefly then, as I promised, to improve this genuine sence, Improvement.

1. By way of *Exposition* of Protestants Charity, wherein Papists much glory: Even We, *say they*, hold that they *may* be saved; We doe but observe in what Cases: 1. In case of *invincible* Ignorance; and thus we hope well of many a devout Soul that dyed in their Communion, in the *night* of Popery, and had not Means or Opportunityes to know better; their walking in all known Duty, and Repenting even of unknown iniquity, might commend them to Gods infinite mercy; but still this is onely our Charity, a Relyance on which, except we had better Judgements than they think we have, makes not for their safety. 2. In case of their Reformation in complyance with after-conviction; and thus we have like hope of *Turks* and *Pagans*, and this I am apt to think is almost generally expected, since the *day* of Gospel Light has begun to dawn, and much more as it grows brighter and brighter, and its beams dart hotter and hotter upon their Consciences: Let the Learned of them especially look to it, for however it goe with the simpler sort, that are so of Necessity, they will hardly escape, Persons and Works too; but if they abide together, now the *day* of the Lord is begun, and his Fire goes forth, they are like to be burnt up, and perish together. And it is not our Charity, nor (may be) Gods Mercy, that will relieve them, while Christs Merit, in despight of all the Convictions of his Spirit, is thus slighted by them.

2. By way of *Call* to ingenuous Papists, to close with this way that is discovered for their Salvation, by quitting their strawy and wooden Superstructions, and giving up all their vain Inventions to their *first Conviction*; I would not have them prevent it, nor delay upon it; it is dangerous abiding in *Babylon, when it is day*, retaining the works of darkness, when it is light; when you do hear Gods Call, (and hearken for it) *Come out from amongst them, lest ye partake of their Plagues*: or to apply what was said to *Lot*, *Gen.* 19. 17. *Escape for your life, look not behind you, neither stay in all the plain, escape to the Mountains, lest you be consumed.* Rev. 18. 4.

3. By way of *Caution* to unwary Protestants, that (may be) hold the Foundation; look also to the Superstruction, take heed of strange and uncouth Opinions, and when you have imbibed them, be not over-tenacious of them, but give them up streight to Conviction, and stand not on the loss of Reputation, the quitting them may be the onely means of thy Salvation. For though there may seem no great evil in thy Opinion, thy obstinacy in adhering to it, when sufficient Light is given to see the

folly of it, may in continuance become the Sin against the Holy Ghost, that will never be forgiven.

Conclusion. To conclude, I read, *Act.* 19. 19, 20. Of many *that had used curious Arts, which brought their Books together, and burnt them before all men, and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of Silver, so mightily grew the Word of God, and prevailed.* A remarkable instance indeed of the power of the Word: That Scholars should be wrought on to burn their Books, their Books of curious Arts, that got them probably their Credit; their Books of such a value. And the truth on't is, to accommodate our present case hereto; mens own Notions and Fancies are dear to them, when no outward advantage follows them, [*Qui velit ingenio cedere rarus erit,*] but much more when their Interests are twisted with them: Yet methinks, their Souls should be much more precious; and for their sakes, I beseech all concerned in the former charge of *foolish Builders*, that they cast away their Idols of Silver and of Gold, to the Bats and to the Moles; and I beseech God in the behalf of *Rome*, and all that partake with it in its unmeet and unworthy Superstructions, though on the common Foundation; that on the warm Application of the Word, they may separate from their *works*, lest as the fire grows hotter, they be consumed with them. A blessed Bonfire it would be, to see their Works all burning, and therein blessed, as it would tend to their Souls saving. But oh! my heart misgives me; if Gods Word so far prevail for their Conviction, what means that crackling Noyse I hear, of Fire and Brimstone prepared for their Destruction? *Rev.* 17. 16. & *ch.* 18. *v.* 8.

Cease frighting one another with your Purgatory flames, that are but imaginary; and fly the Fire of Gods Wrath, kindled at his Jealousie, that is like to prey upon you unto all Eternity.

SER-

SERMON XXV.

The Visibility of the True Church.

Matth. XVI. 18.

And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.*

OUR Blessed Lord being within the Territories of *Cæsarea Philippi* (neer *Lebanon* and the Fountains of *Jordan*, where *Philip* the Tetrarch of *Ituræa* and *Trachonitis* had his Royal Seat or Throne) was pleased to put two Questions to his Disciples: 1. Whom did men commonly suppose him to be? 2. Whom more especially did they judge and acknowledge him? To this demand, *Peter* in the (*a*) name of the rest (for our Lord propounded the question to them all) replies and confesses him to be the true *Messiah*, the Son of the living God.

(*a*) *Petrus ex persona omnium Apostolorum*, &c. Hieron. in loc. Tom. 9. p. 30.

Upon this glorious Confession, our Lord and Saviour,

1. Pronounces a heavenly blessing to *Peter*, *v.* 17.

2. Acquaints him and the rest present, that upon himself whom he had confessed to be the Son of the living God, not only *Peter*, but his whole Church should be firmly built, *v.* 18.

3. He makes a Promise to him and the rest, of Ministerial power, *v.* 19. which he performed unto all, when he breathed on them the Holy Ghost, *Joh.* 20. 22, 23.

In the 18th *verse*, besides the Preface. [*And I say also unto thee,*] we have three principal parts.

I. *Encomium Petri*, or a Laudatory Testimony, bestowed upon *Peter*, and in him, upon all, of whom he had demanded answer; *Thou art*

Peter, &c. In which our Lord does not *now first* give him that Name, for that was done before, *Joh.* 1. 42. where our Lord told him, that thenceforth he should be called *Cephas* or *Peter* (which is by Interpretation a stone) as God of Old had declared concerning the name of *Abraham* and *Israel*; and as *Elizabeth* about the Name of her Son *John*. In this denomination of *Peter*, there is a manifest allusion to the following words, by an elegant *Paranomasia* or παρανομασίωσις: Thou art *Peter*, whom I have formerly called by the name of a Stone, to note thy being built upon that Foundation-stone, that Rock of Ages whom the Father hath layd in *Zion*.

Gen. 17. 5. 32. 28.

Glass. Rhet. Tract. 2. Cap. 2.

II. A Declaration of our Lord concerning his Church, which he compares to a House, Palace, or City, wherein observe,

1. The Foundation of this Building, *On this Rock*, representing him whom thou hast confess'd.

2. The Architect, *I will build.*

3. The Edifice, *My Church.* Not any particular Church exclusive to others; but the whole Church Catholick. This Text assigns no *diplomæ* or Priviledge to the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Constantinople*, *Carthage*, or ancient *Rome*, or any other particular Church, otherwise than as parts and parcels of the whole Church; or as there may have been found in them, such as by lively Faith and sound Doctrine were built upon Christ, the onely true and living Rock, the sure and precious Foundation of his Church. As to the timeing of the Verb: I *will* build, *that* no way excludes the ancient Fathers before our Lords Incarnation, who all dyed in Faith, and without whom we are not made perfect; but notes the continuation of this divine work in building up the Church, till the Top-stone be laid in the end of the World, with Acclamations of Grace. It pre-signifies the enlargement of the Church among the *Gentiles*, by the Ministerial Edification of the Apostles, according to that famous Prophecy in *Zechary*, of the latter times, when they that are afar off, shall come and build in the Temple of the Lord, consonant to the tenor of the whole New Testament.

Heb. 11. 13. Vers. 40.

Zech. 6. 12, 13.

III. The Perennity or Perpetuity of the Church. Our Lord addes a Promise as strong as the Foundation it self, for the Mouth of *the Lord* hath spoken it; That his Church shall be *monumentum ære perennius*, more durable than Heaven and Earth: for they shall pass away with great Noyse, the Elements melt, the Earth, and the works therein shall be burnt up: The Foundations of the Earthly Mountains may be set on fire: *Ætna*, *Vesuvius* and *Hecla* may vomit out their burning bowels. The Channels of the Sea may appear, and the inmost Caverns of the World be discovered; nay the foundations of Heaven may be moved, and shake, and its Pillars tremble, when God is wroth: But the Church of God shall persist and endure against all assaults, against all oppositions imaginable. For 'tis *his* Church, against whom all created power is but weakness, their machinations and contrivements a thousand times more

2 Pet. 3. 10.

Deut. 32. 22.

2 Sam. 22. 16.

Vers. 8.

Isa. 59. 5.

more frail than the most delicate and tender Web of a Spider. The waves that foam against this Rock, dash themselves in pieces, and (as the Prophet elegantly;) they are cut off as Foam upon the Water, as Bubbles (puffit up with swelling Pride and Animosity against the Church) suddenly subside, and shrink into the bosome of their primitive water. The Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it. The glorious Building of the Church, assaulted it may be and shall be, but prevailed upon or demolisht, never. Like Mount *Zion* she shall never be moved; nay, she cannot be moved, for the Highest himself hath establish'd her, *there's* her *inward* stability: And as to the repelling of all *external* force and fury, *as the Mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people for ever.* The Church shall never be extirpated out of the World. The Rain may descend, the Floods rush, and the Winds roar and beat upon this House; but it stands inviolable against all weathers and storms, for it is founded upon the Rock. Enemies may fret awhile, fume and boyle in the brine of their own Anger, and (like Bodies molested with sharp and corrosive humours) become self-tormenters, at last are emacerated, wasted and dissolved. 'Tis Wisdom it self, having hewn out her seven Pillars hath built this House, truely deserving the honourable name of S. *Sophia*, (more than that magnificent Structure at *Constantinople*) the Temple of Sacred Wisdom.

Hos. 10. 7. Psal. 125. 1. Psal. 87. 5. Ps. 125. 2. Mat. 7. 25. Prov. 9. 1.

The farther Explication of the words may be referred to the handling of this Position or main point deducible out of the bowels of this Text:

That the Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of the living God, is the onely Foundation of his Church, and the preserver of its duration in some measure visibly throughout all Ages. *Observ.*

Wherein three things are to be discussed, in such a method as a Textual Sermon may admit.

1. We are to treat of the Church of Christ, what it is, and whereof it consists.

2. Of the Foundation of the Church, that it is Christ, and Christ onely.

3. Of the Duration and Continuance of the Church upon this glorious and strong Foundation, in some state of Visibility through all Ages. Though sometimes it may appear more conspicuous, and sometimes less. As the Sun may be sometimes Ecclipsed, and that totally to some places in the Terrestrial Globe, though in it self never extinguisht, nor its radiant beams wholly withdrawn from all parts of the Hemisphere at the precise time of the compleat interposure of the Moons body. Sometimes he may be mantled in a Sable Cloud, and that for many dayes together; sometimes he may have driven his Chariot to visit our *Antipodes*; sometimes his visible Diameter is larger, and sometimes lesser; sometimes he warms our Zenith, and sometimes comforts the Antartick Pole. Neither

is.

is the Queen of the Night a less fit resemblance, being much more variable in her Phases and Appearances. Such hath been the Fate of the Church of God: Now direfully Ecclipsed by bloody Persecutions, Then shining out the more illustriously; Now clouded with thick vails of Error and Heresie, Then vigorously conquering by the bright Rayes of Truth. Now dim and dusky by the thick Foggs and Mists of Superstitious Ceremonies, Then more beautifull and Orient in her naked simplicity, and Apostolical Lustre; being cloathed with the Sun, and a Crown of Twelve Stars upon her head.

Rev. 12. 1.

(1) As to the first, *What the Church of Christ is?* We find it here compared to a House, to a stately Palace, or Princes Mansion, or Castle of Defence, built upon an impregnable Rock: Nay, 'tis the House of the Living God, typed by that ancient sumptuous Temple of *Solomon*. Sometimes 'tis resembled to a City, to the City of *David*, founded and built upon the renowned Mountain of *Zion*, which shadowes forth both its Duration and Visibility. But the Metaphor, as a Vail or a Glass, being laid aside; as under the Notion of a quick Rock, we contemplate the onely begotten Son of the Living God, so by the Regular and well-polish'd Materials of the super-imposed building, we are to understand the lively Stones mentioned in *Peter*, which coming to him by Faith, are built up into a Spiritual House. Such as compose the Structure of the Church are the adopted Children of God. The learned of the Reformed Churches have a little varied in Expressions, but agree in the Substance. That the Church of God is a company of Holy Persons, chosen of God from Eternity, in Christ, unto Eternal Life. The Church consists of Men, not of Angels, and therefore must be Visible: They are Holy ones, not Hypocrites or profane persons, who may sometimes thrust into the Communion of the External Visible Church. They are such, who in Gods due time are called out of the World, by the Ministry of the Word, and the inward Efficacious Grace of his Spirit. Let's summe up these particulars in that Declaration which the Church of *England* hath exhibited to us †.

1 Tim. 3. 15.
1 King. 6. 1.
Isa. 2. 1.
Mic. 4. 1.
Ps. 46. 1.
48. 5.
87. 3.
Rev. 21. 2.
1 Pet. 2. 5.

† *Homilies* of the Church of *England*, in the 2d part of the Sermon for *Whit-Sunday*.

"The true Church is an Universal Congregation or Fellowship of "Gods faithfull and Elect people, built upon the Foundation of the Apo- "stles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Head corner-Stone.

"And it hath alwayes three Notes or Marks, whereby it is known: "Pure and Sound Doctrine; the Sacraments ministred according "to Christs Holy Institution; and the right use of Ecclesiastical Disci- "pline."

Upon the particular Branches of this Description, I must not enlarge, onely acquaint you at present, that I shall here treat of some peculiar points referring to that true real Church of Christ whereof our Lord speaks in this Text: Such, as being founded upon him by Faith, cemented to him by Love, worships him in Spirit and Truth; against which all the Powers of Darkness shall never prevail; but shall continue successively

2 Thess. 2. 13.
Act. 26. 18.
Joh. 4. 24.

ceſſively throughout all Ages here upon Earth; ſometimes ſhining more clearly, otherwhiles more obſcurely, yet alwayes in ſome meaſure *viſible* and diſcernible by the marks of true Doctrine, Worſhip and Diſcipline; and at length ſhall be wholly tranſlated to Eternal Communion with Chriſt their moſt glorious head in the higheſt Heavens.

(2) As to the Foundation of this Church, we aſſert that Jeſus Chriſt is the Rock, the ſolid and onely Foundation whereupon 'tis built, which may be demonſtrated, 1. *Negatively* or *Excluſively* as to all others. 2. *Poſitively* as to Chriſt himſelf.

1. *Excluſively*. No other is, or can be admitted for the Rock or Foundation of the Church. ὅτι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ On *this* ſingle, individual Rock will I build my Church. No other can communicate in this high and ſupereminent Honour.

Obj. But ſome may ſay, Does not the Pronoun in the Text relate moſt properly to the next Antecedent, *Peter*; and not to *Chriſt*. Is it not more genuine?

Anſ. 1. This Grammaticiſme will not conclude. For, 1. Tis commonly otherwiſe in many other places of Scripture, as *Gen.* 10. 12. *Joh.* 8. 44. *Heb.* 12. 17. *Act.* 19. 5. and particularly, *Mat.* 26. 26. If in that Enunciation [*This is my Body,*] *This* ſhould be referred to *bread*, the immediate Antecedent, then (as the learned obſerve) there's an end of their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation: If they will preſs ſuch a Grammatical Nicety upon that as upon this Text. But 2dly, Though the Name of *Peter* be found neereſt in words, yet 'tis alſo obſerved, that the Perſon of Chriſt in moſt proper ſence and relation ſtands higheſt to the Rock upon whom *Peter* was built, and who had received that Denomination from his Confeſſion of the true and living Rock, the Son of God, *the* Chriſt, *v.* 20. *Glaſſ. Gram. Sacr. l. 3. Tract. 2. Can.* 10.

A. 2. But laying aſide that Grammatical conteſt, let's ſhew, That *Peter* was not, could not be the Rock whereon the Church is built.

For, 1. *Peter* was but a Man. Now no meer man can ſuſtain the wrath of an infinite God, or Redeem the Church by his Blood. The Apoſtle determines him to be God, who hath *purchaſed* the Church by his own blood; and the Author to the *Hebrews* declares, that the ſame Perſon who had by himſelf purged our ſins, is *ſet down on the right hand of the Majeſty on high*; the ſame to whom the Father ſpeaks, *Thy throne O God is for ever and ever*, that *High-prieſt who is entred within the Vail*; that *Son of God, who is paſſed into the Heavens*. Such a one *became us, who is made higher than the Heavens*. Chriſt the Head of the Church, who *is alſo the Saviour of his Body*, and gave himſelf for it; *who loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his Blood*. Act. 20. 28. Heb. 1. 3. Verſe 8. Chap. 6. 19. Ch. 4. 14. Ch. 7. 26. Eph. 5. 23, 25. Rev. 1. 5.

2. *Peter* was a Frail mortal man. But God had his Church, and *that* built upon this Rock, before ever *Peter* was born, and continued after his Death and Funeral. God the Father had laid this Foundation, מֹרַסַּר מֹרָסָר, *Fundamentum fundatum*, this ſtrong Foundation, long before Iſa. 28. 16.

before *Esay*'s time; which the *Chaldee* Paraphrase Glosses thus: [מַלְכָּא מַלְכָּא תַקִּיף גִּבָּר רְאַמְתָּן, *the King, the Powerfull King, the strong and terrible.*] And *Rabbi Solomon* expressely, *The King Messiah, that he may be in Zion a Stone of Munition and strength,*] as *Petrus Galatinus* recites out of him and others of the Rabbins. The Prophets of Old, as well as the Apostles, built upon this Foundation. Besides, when *Peter* came upon the Stage, he goes off again; and when *Peter* dyes, must the Church perish? The Foundation being gone, the Building must needs tumble, neither does our Lord any where speak of, or promise to any Successors so great a Priviledge to step into his room, to lye in the Foundation, and to be the supposed *Atlas* of his Church; and were it so, then *Peter* personal must be dismiss'd.

Galatin. l. 3. c. 21.
Eph. 2. 20.

3. *Peter* was a *sinfull* man, and that by his own Confession, [*Depart from me, for I am a sinfull man, O Lord*] and this was acknowledg'd, after that our Lord had called him by the name of *Peter*. Nay more than so, *Peter* erred in Faith about the Death and Resurrection of Christ, and our Lord rebuked him sharply, as being under a tentation of Satan; nay, he thrice denyed our Lord. But because some would apply the Promise in the Text, to a Performance after the Resurrection, the Holy Scripture (as if on purpose to obviate these futilous Objections) sets it down that even *then* he did not ὀρθοποδεῖν, not walk uprightly in the Gospel, and *Paul* withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. Shall we then think, that the Church was founded upon a sinfull man? since such a High-priest becomes the Church, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners; a Lamb without blemish and spot.

Luke 5. 8.
Mat. 16. 22, 23.
Mat. 26. 75.
Gal. 2. 14.
Verse 11.
Heb. 7. 26.
1 Pet. 1, 19.

4. *Peter* determines the Point himself, and expounds the Prophecy in *Esay* of Christ, and he himself doctrinally layes down Christ for the true and onely Foundation in the *Zion* of the Church; disallowed indeed by *Pharisees* and the proud builders of *Babel*, but approved of God, and solemnly preach'd by *Peter* at *Jerusalem*, and unanimously attested by all the Apostles, and recognized for the onely true Foundation of the Church. Will any then, that so admire and adore *Peter* for their own ends, yet dare to gainsay him to the face, and force him into the Foundation, so flatly against himself?

1 Pet. 2. 4 5, 6, 7.
Act. 2. 22. Vers. 14.
Ch. 4. 11, 12.

5. *Peter* as meer *Peter*, could never victoriously grapple with the Assaults of Satan; he had been finally and fatally foiled, had not Christ prayed, had not this Rock sustained him. The Church must have a Foundation against which all the Gates of Hell can never prevail, and which infuses Vertue and invincible consistency into the Building it self; as if a quick and living Rock should inspire and breathe into the stones of a Palace fixt upon it, some of those Mineral Eradiations wherewith it self is endued, to preserve it from mouldering and turning into dust. The Church must have a vital and quickening Foundation, that it may not only stand against impetuous windes, but be a growing Temple, and increase

Eph 2. 21.

creaſe with the Increaſe of God. The Church hath ſuch potent, ſubtle, and furious Enemies, that ſhe needs ſtrength from the mighty God of *Jacob*, the Shepherd, *the Stone of Iſrael*; one that is ſtronger than that infernal ſtrong man armed; a Lion of the Tribe of *Judah*, that can tear that Lion of Hell in pieces. Col. 2. 19. Gen. 49. 24. Luk. 11. 21, 22. Rev. 5. 5.

Since then *Peter* was but a *meer* man, a frail, *mortal* man, a *ſinfull* man, weak and *impotent* to reſiſt the Powers of Darkneſs, and one that abſolutely *rejects* any ſuch honour from himſelf or any other, as abhorring ſuch derogation from the Glory of his and our moſt bleſſed Saviour; let's inferre that [*this Rock*] in the Text, can in no wiſe be meant of *Peter*, or any other of the Apoſtles. And that this was the ſence of the ancient Church, I might abundantly prove; let it ſuffice to recite but two or three teſtimonies.

Chryſoſtom on this Text, *Upon this Rock*, expounds it τουτέστι τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας on the Faith of Confeſſion, *i. e.* upon Chriſt, in whom thou believeſt, and whom thou haſt confeſſed. And let *Chryſoſtom* explain himſelf: [οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐπὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ὅτι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἀλλ' ὅτι τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ᾠκοδόμησε *He ſaid not upon* Peter, *for he did not build his Church upon a Man, but upon the Faith of himſelf.*] *Chryſoſtom*, Tom. 4. p. 344. Edit. Eton. *Id. in* Homil. 1. in Pentecoſt. Tom. 8. p. 979.

In like manner *Ambroſe*, or his Contemporary, upon the 2d of the *Epheſians*, citing this Text, [*Super iſtam Petram, hoc eſt, in hâc Catholicæ Fidei Confeſſione ſtatuo fideles ad vitam.*] *Upon this Rock*, that is, upon this Confeſſion of the Catholick Faith, do I fix, *ſettle or build* Believers unto Salvation. But of all, none more clear than *Auſtin*, in his Sermons upon *Matthew*; [*Super hanc Petram quam confeſſus es*, i. e. *ſuper meipſum Filium Dei vivi, &c. ſuper Me ædificabo Te, non Me ſuper Te, &c.*] Upon this Rock whom thou haſt confeſſed, *i.* upon my ſelf the Son of the living God, *&c.* I will build Thee upon Me, not Me upon Thee. Again, in his 124th Treatiſe on *John*, [*Super hanc Petram quam confeſſus es, &c. Petra erat Chriſtus ſuper quod fundamentum etiam ipſe ædificatus eſt Petrus.*] Upon this Rock which thon haſt confeſſed, *&c.* the Rock was Chriſt, upon which Foundation even *Peter* himſelf was built. Again, in his 10th Treatiſe upon the Epiſtle of *John*, [*Super hanc Petram, &c. ſuper hanc fidem, ſuper id quod dictum eſt, Tu es Chriſtus Filius Dei vivi, &c.*] Upon this Rock, *&c.* upon this Faith, upon that which had been ſpoken of (*i. e.* by *Peter*) thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God. So that when *Auſtin* or other of the Fathers explain this Rock, by this Faith, or this Confeſſion, we ſee they underſtood it Objectively of our bleſſed Lord, the Son of God. Many more might be cited, but I haſten. *Ambroſ* in c. 2. *Epheſ.* p. 1998. Edit. Par. 1569. *Auguſtin* in Matth. Serm. 13. Tom. 10. p. 58. Edit. Baſ. 1569. Id. Tract. 124. in Joh. Evang. Tom. 9. p. 572. Id. Tract. 10. in Epiſt. Johan. Tom. 9. p. 649. So *Sixt.* 2. in Decret. *Gratian.* cauſ. 24. q. 1. c. 10. col. 1835.

Obj. Some have replyed, That though *Peter* be not the main, principal and eſſential Foundation of the Church, yet he may be admitted as a Secondary, a Vicarian, a Miniſterial Foundation, without detriment to the Honour of Chriſt.

A. 1. I anſwer, this Secondary Foundation, is an abſurd diſtinction,

and contrary to the very Nature of a Foundation. Whatever is laid upon the Foundation, is a Superstructure or part of the Building. *Vitruvius*, the grand Master of *Roman* Architecture, taught his *Romanists* no such fond language, when he mentions Foundations in three several places; nor *Barbarus* upon him, nor *Palladius*. Let s pass then from Artificial to the Metaphorical or Spiritual Buildings, for whose support Scripture supplies us with no such Additions, or Coagmentati ns with the main Foundation. If any should urge out of *Paul*, that the *Ephesians* were built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; it must be understood of a Doctrinal foundation, not an Essential: for Christ himself is expressely *there* termed the Corner-stone, the λίθος ἀκρογωνιαῖος, the grand Massie stone, that fills up the whole *area*, and reaches to all four Corners, on whom *solely all* the Building, πᾶσα, the *whole* Building is fitly framed together. The Apostles indeed did *lay* this foundation and no other, and the *Ephesian* Saints were built upon this foundation of the Apostles, *i. e.* which the Apostles did lay, and so 'tis call'd *their* foundation, *architectonicè*, or by a Metonymie. They preaching the Doctrine of Faith in Christ, did lay down for the sole Rock this great and fundamental point (though rejected of the *Jewish* Builders) that there is no *other Name given under Heaven among men, whereby we must be saved.*

Vitruv. l. 1. c. 3. & 5. & l. 3. c. 3.

Eph. 2. 20.

Verse 21.

1 Cor. 3. 11.

Act. 4. 12.

2. Again, This their secondary Foundation, (which we say is Doctrinal onely) must be co-extended to all the Apostles and Prophets, by the Plumb line of the same Text; and therefore their laying of *Peter* for the onely foundation, though but Secondary, will sink as in the Moorish ground by *Tyber*, and will prove no single foundation at all; for all the other Apostles are joynt-heirs of the same preheminence. Holy *Paul*, (speaking of such a Doctrinal foundation,) sayes, that he preach'd the Gospel where Christ was not named, lest he should build on another mans foundation.

Rom. 15. 20.

3. Hence it appears, that the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, is all the Foundation that the Apostle pretends to, *viz.* to a Doctrinal laying of Christ, as the true foundation of his Church. *Paul* was but a workman, a Labourer dexterously handling his Evangelical Instruments, and *Peter* was no other: Nay, *Paul* testifies, that he laboured abundantly, more than they all, in laying this foundation, and building upon it: for *so* (sayes he) we preach'd, and *so* ye believed. *No other Foundation can any man lay*; he speaks it ἁπλῶς & ἀπαράβατος, both expressely and exclusively, παρὲξ τὸ κείμενον, *praeter quod jactum vel positum est.* No other *besides* it. Μηδὲν ἔξω μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ, None between us and Christ, as *Chrysostom* glosses it, and proceeds; ἂν γὰρ γένηται μέσον, ἐνθένδε ἀπολλύμεθα, κἂν τὸ μικρότατον. If any thing interpose between us and Christ, though in the least, we perish presently.

1 Cor. 15. 10, 11, 12.

1 Cor. 3. 11.

Chrys. in 1 *Cor.* 3. Tom. 3. p. 297.

4. Again, If *Peter* had been any such Secondary Foundation, surely *Paul*, who received the Gospel by the Revelation of *Jesus Christ*, would,

Gal. 1. 12.

nay,

nay, *must* have excepted him from the rest of the Apostles, or at least have conjoyned him with *Christ*, and have laid single *Peter* next and immediately upon him. But this is *Vatican* Doctrine, and to be found no where but in the fained Acts or Revelation of *Paul*, which *Gelasius* condemned for Apocryphal.

To conclude then, since our blessed Lord and Head of the Church hath declared no Vicegerent, being a Spiritual King, the Son of the Living God, who searches the Hearts and Reins, and is Omnipresent by his Divinity, and promised to be with his Church in all Ages, by vertue of his Spirit; He needs no Vice-Roy, has instituted or appointed none; and *Peter* exercised and performed no such Office, but calls himself συμπρεσβύτερος, (as 'tis in the *Greek*) a *Fellow-presbyter*, with such as feed the *Flock of Christ*; since *Paul* and *John* make all the Apostles equal in Preaching, and laying down this *Foundation*, the Doctrine of *Faith* in *Christ*, the Son of the Living God: Let us then fairly lay *Peter* aside, without any diminution to his Apostolical Honour, which we greatly reverence, and look upon him as perfectly equal (*pari consortio*, as *Cyprian* speaks) with the rest of the holy Apostles, and let us with all Adoration and Joy, behold *Him*, (whose Shooe-latchet *Peter* was not worthy to loose,) as laid by the *Father* in *Zion*, and firmly believe in him as the Son of the living God, whom *Peter* confess'd to be the Rock, and preach'd him up in the face of the Elders of *Israel*, for the onely *Foundation* of the Church.

Rev. 2. 23. Mat. 28. 20. 1 Pet. 5. 1. Rev. 21. 14. P. 163. *Edit. Bas.* 153. Cypr. *de Simpl. Prill.* *Marsil. Patav. defens. Pacis*, part. 2. c. 15. p. 198. Act. 4. 10, 11.

If *Peter* then be not the Essential and Personal *Foundation* of the Church, (which were Blasphemy to assert;) if the Secondary *Foundation* be a Nullity, Then down falls all the pretended Successors of *Peter*, whether at *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, or *Antioch* in *Syria*, or any of the Cities of *Pontus* and *lesser Asia*; much more their wooden Seat at *Rome* (as *Baronius* shapes it) *A.* 45. *n.* 11. as the furthest, so the weakest pretenders to succeed the Apostle of the *Circumcision*. Nay although it were granted that he were at *Rome*, which some Learned men stiffly deny; though he might suffer at *Rome*, which others out of *Jerom* and *Lyra* insinuate to be a misinformation, and that he was crucified by the *Jews*; These things impair not our cause, since *Peter* had no more power than any other of the Apostles, and therefore could transmit no more to his supposed Successors. For 'tis a stated Rule in their own Canon-Law, *Nemo plus juris in alium transfert, quam sibi competit*; None can transferre that to another, which he hath not himself: And that other for a Successor, *Is qui in jus succedit alterius, eo jure, quo ille, uti debebit.* He that succeeds in anothers Right, must content himself with the Right of his Predecessor.

Gal. 2. 7, 8. *Reg. juris* 79. *in* 6. *Decretal. l.* 5. *Reg.* 46.

II. *Positively.* That *Christ* our holy and blessed Redeemer, is the onely True and Real *Foundation* and Rock of the Church. *Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* He is that Elect and *precious Corner-stone*, on which all true Builders doe

1 Cor. 3. 11. Eph. 2. 20.

ædifie the Church of God. Being rooted and built up in him, and ſtabliſhed in the Faith. To this, the Apoſtle *Peter* brings in his clear evidence, *To whom*, as the *Foundation laid* of God, *ye coming as living ſtones, are built up a ſpiritual Houſe.* Parallel to this of a Foundation, is that other Metaphor of a Head, taken from the Natural Body; In which reſpect Chriſt is every where declared to be this glorious Head of the Church. *He is the head of the Church, and Saviour of the Body.* As the Head is ſtrictly conjoyned to the living Body; ſo between Chriſt and the Church there is a Sacred and intimate Union. As the Head by the ſeveral conjugations of the Nerves, propagated from the Brain and ſpinal Marrow, derives thoſe curious volatile and vital influences, for the actuating of the ſeveral ſenſes, and for the Rule and Government of the whole Body in all its motions: So doth Chriſt vivifie and quicken the ſpiritual ſenſes, inſtruct, guide and govern every member of his ſpiritual Body the Church. To confirm this a little, and paſs to the third branch of the Text.

Col. 2. 7.
Iſa. 28. 16.
1 Pet. 2.
Rom. 12. 5.
1 Cor. 12. 27.
Eph. 1. 23. 4. 15. 5. 23.
Col. 1. 18, 24. 2. 19.
Heb. 5. 14.

1. *God* the Father *gave* Chriſt to be head over all to the Church, and exalted Him far above all Principalities, and hath put all things under His feet. God *laid* Him in *Zion* for a Foundation, and no other: The Church is the City of God, and he hath *eſtabliſh'd* it for ever. It's built upon *his* Foundation in the holy Mountains, and the *Higheſt* himſelf will eſtabliſh her. The head-ſtone of the corner fixt in *Zion* is of the *Lords doing*. And as the Foundation, ſo the whole Ædifice of the Church is οἰκοδομὴ θεοῦ the *building of God*.

Eph. 1. 21, 22.
Iſa. 28. 16.
Pſal. 48. 8.
Pſ. 87. 1, 5.
Pſal. 118. 22, 23.
1 Cor. 3. 9.

2. *Chriſt* in the Text builds his Church upon no other than himſelf, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ *on this Rock will I build my Church*; and *Chriſt* being the Son of God, is more Honourable than *Moſes*, becauſe *he builds* this Houſe of the Church.

Heb. 3. 3.

3. The *Spirit* of God *fits* no other for a Habitation of God, but This Church built upon This Foundation; he increaſes no other with divine and heavenly growth but This.

Eph. 2. 22.
Col. 2. 19.

4. Such a Foundation muſt be *laid*, againſt which the gates of Hell ſhall never prevail; but Chriſt onely is ſuch a Foundation. Becauſe he lives, the Church lives alſo. No meer man can perform this function. *Peter* falls not finally, becauſe Chriſt prayes prevalently; *Paul* ſtands ſtoutly againſt the buffets of Satan in the Sufficiency of Chriſts Grace and Power. And all the Saints are victorious and triumphant, and more than conquerours through him who loveth them, and ſing that ἐπινίκιον, in his Name, and wave the Imperial Standard, the flag of Triumph, like that of *Conſtantine*, *Sub hoc vinces*; in the Sacred words of *Paul*, *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the Victory through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. Since then *God* the *Father* hath laid no other Foundation, and *Chriſt* builds upon no other, and the *Spirit* Influences and quickens no other; ſince no other can ſupport and defend the Church: Let's pronounce them bleſſed whom God hath joyned, and let none dare to impoſe or conjoyn another, at their Eternal peril. 'Tis an Idol-founda-

Joh. 14. 19.
2 Cor. 12 9.
Rom. 8. 37.
1 Cor. 15. 57.

tion

tion of their foolish brains; our glorious Lord will not give his Honour to another.

(3.) We are now in view of the Third and last Branch of the Text; The *Duration of the Church of Christ*, in some state of Visibility throughout all Ages; fortified by the Promise of Christ, that the Gates of Hell shall be successeless in their Attempts against it.

The Church as it is built on Christ, as far as it cohæres and sticks close to this Foundation, by that virtue communicated to it from the intimate connexion with, and union to Christ, can never be dissolved and perish. Neither can external adverse Power demolish it, or secret Subtlety undermine it, so as to render it altogether invisible; and therefore it must and shall so persist, throughout all Ages.

We have here three parts considerable,

1. The Churches Opposites; πύλαι Ἅδου *The Gates of Hell*, or of Death and Hell. I shall not dwell upon the Niceties of these terms: Let it suffice, that they signifie the infernal Powers of Darkness, and all that are animated or inspired by them with subtle counsels, and irritated into cruel Machinations, and warlike Agitations against the Church. Not onely open Persecutors, but cunning Hereticks do build the Gates of Hell, and discharge their Artillery against the City of God. As *Origen* spake of *Marcion*, *Basilides*, and *Valentinus*, those ancient Hereticks, Ἅδου πύλας ᾠκοδόμησαν. that they built several Gates in the City of *Babylon*; so may we say of *Nero*, *Trajan*, and *Diocletian*, the ancient Persecutors, they mounted their battering Rammes, and managed the *ballistæ fulminales*, they shot their enraged Arrowes against the Church of God, and their followers have been no less sedulous, though as unsuccessefull to this very day. *Origen* in Matth. gr. lat. Edit. 1668. p. 377.

2. The *grandia Molimina*, their great Undertakings. They shall put forth all their strength and policy; whatever the Lion and Serpent can entwine together; what a cunning *Julian* could contrive, or a fierce *Maximinus* execute against the Church; whatever the wit, malice and power of Earth and Hell, could with most inflamed rage either enterprize or atchieve, hath been carryed on to the utmost, but all in vain. They imagine a vain thing against the Lord and his Anointed. The Church like her glorious Head shall never see corruption, though all the puissance of the adverse City march into the Field against her. The *Egyptian City of Destruction* (to allude to that in *Esay*) shall attempt, but all shall prove ineffectual, for the Name of this City is *Jehovah-Shammah*, *the Lord is there*. The Church hath been assaulted *vi & arte*, by open force and secret fraud; but *no Weapon formed against Zion* shall finally prosper. Psal. 2. 1, 2. Isa. 19. 18. Ezek. 48. 35. Isa. 54. 17.

3. The *Churches Duration*; she must and shall continue till all the Enemies Arrowes are spent, their courage daunted, and their City ruined and laid in ashes. For the Lord will miserably destroy those wicked men, and our blessed Saviour proves it out of the 118th *Psalm*. Mat. 21. 41, 42. Psal. 118. 22.

For

For the Stone which the Builders refused, is become the head of the corner. Whosoever falls upon *this* stone shall be broken, and on whomsoever *it* falls, it shall grinde him to powder. This is that burdensome
Zech. 12. 3. stone in *Zechary*. This is the Stone with Seven Eyes engraven upon it;
3. 9. The Stone cut out of the Mountain, that shall fill the whole Earth.
Dan. 2. 34, 35.

For the handling this Third part of the Position, the *Churches Duration* in all Ages, it's necessary to know this Church by those Notes and τεκμηρια that have appeared as notable Characters of the true Church in all Ages, against which the Gates of Hell have set their principal Batteries, and thereby to evidence and prove its continual *Duration* and *Visibility*.

Since then, the Church is built upon Christ, the Rock of Ages; since Christ is the onely Head and Bridegroom of the Church, he the onely chief Shepherd, and since that which makes the intimate Union between Christ and the Church, is Faith wrought in the Hearts of all the true members by the Spirit of Christ: This may be one Note:

Note 1. 1. *That wherever this Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Christ has been maintain'd and sincerely defended*, there *hath been visibly the True Church of Christ*. And it might be amply evinced, that this Heavenly Doctrine hath been conserved in all Ages, against all the furious Assaults of its Enemies.

Note 2. 2. *Since Jesus Christ, the onely Head of the Church, is her glorious Lord, the Son of the Living God, he ought to be worshipt by her. He*
Psal. 45. 11. *is thy Lord, and worship thou him*; and this Worship must be performed
Joh. 4. 23. in Spirit and Truth. But here, because all the three persons in the
5. 23. Divine Essence, are one God, I shall consider this Worship, as termi-
12. 26. nated Objectively in God Essential; and since that this most Holy and Glorious God, abhorres Idolatry, and worshipping of him by Idols, Images, Pictures, or any other Symbol to represent him, or by which, (as helps to Devotion) to accend and inflame the Heart in Worship; this may be set down as another Note of the true Church, which keeps the Com-
Rev. 14. 12. mandments of God in point of Worship mentioned before, *v.* 9. And indeed, in respect to worshipping of God by Images, consists the very Essence and Formality of the Second Commandment. The First being *de Objecto cultus*; That God is the true and onely Object of Religious Worship, the Second is, *de modo & mediis cultûs:* That God who is exceeding Jealous of his own Glory, detests and abhorres to be worship'd by the Intervention of Idols, and to present any Adoration before them, though men may excuse it, and profess that God is the ultimate term of their Worship. But these things I must leave to be more amply insisted upon by such whose peculiar Province it is to handle them more distinctly: But so far 'tis necessary here to use and improve them as critical *marks and notes* of the true Church, the one in point of Doctrine, the other in point of Worship. The true Church of Christ hath in all times, according to the holy Scriptures, born a Testimony to these two grand points,

points, and I shall endeavour to prove it as to both. There be other points, I confess, and very material, whereby this Truth might be exemplified, but I chose these as Cardinal.

I. For the Point of *Justification by Faith.*

This particular is best worded in Scripture Language, to which all must adhere. Though mens sentiments may vary in the Explication, yet I think it most fit to lay it down in the words of holy *Paul*, indited by the Spirit of God.

That a man is justified by Faith, without the Works of the Law: Rom. 3. 28.
They have no Ingrediency into our Justification before God. If they had, it were not *by Grace*, and if by Grace, then it is no more of Works; and Rom. 11. 6.
this Work of free Grace proceeds on to Salvation it self. *For by Grace* Eph. 2. 8, 9.
are ye saved through Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the Gift of God. Not of Works, lest any man should boast. Not by Works of Right- Tit. 3. 5, 7.
eousness which we have done, &c. Being justified *by his Grace.* That which the Apostle had set down *privatively* before, here he sets it down *negatively*, as in that to the *Galatians. A man is not justified by the* Gal. 2. 16.
Works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ, &c. Now whereas their Cardinal *and others*, would have *Paul* to exclude the Works of *Bell. de. Justif. l. 1. c. 25.*
the Ceremonial Law, not the Works of the Moral Law, or the Gospel; that cannot stand; for then we should still be justified by Works: But the Apostle puts Works and Faith in a Diametrical Opposition; and after that he himself was in a Regenerate Estate, desired to be found Phil. 3. 9.
in Christ, not having *his own Righteousness*, which *is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith*; and that though he were conscious of nothing by himself, yet herein he was not justified. Yea that Works done with Faith, 1 Cor. 4. 4.
Ex Ratione Operum, upon the account of Works, do not justifie, as the *Rivet. Controv. Tract. 4. q. 10. p. 263.*
Apostle amplifies it in the case of *Abraham*; no nor Faith it self as a Work, but as it apprehends the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet the Apostle Rom. 4. 3. 22.
charges *Titus* to *affirm constantly, that they which believe in God, must be* Tit. 3. 8.
carefull to maintain good Works, for these things are good and profitable to men. They are necessary to Salvation, though they have not a formal Ingrediency into our Justification. The holy Apostle professes, that Gal. 2. 20.
by this Faith in the Son of God he did live, and in this Faith he would dye; desiring to be found in no other at the appearing of Christ. This was Phil. 3. 9, &c.
the ancient Faith of the Primitive Apostolical Church of Christ, and the *good Old Way* of the ancient *Roman.* On this Rock Christ hath built his Church, *sc.* on himself by Faith. This is *Articulus stantis atque cadentis Ecclesiæ*, The grand Article, which being maintained, the Church *Luth.*
flourishes; being rejected, she perishes.

I might here, out of every Age of the Church since our Lord, produce clear Evidences for this Doctrine of *Paul*, dictated by the Spirit of God. I might shew its preservation by the ancient Fathers, and how attested by some of the Councels; by whom it may appear in what Coun-

Countries this Apostolical Doctrine was taught and embraced. By *Hilary* in *France*, *Ambrose* in *Lombardy*, *Chrysostom* in *Syria* and *Thrace*, *Jerom* in *Palestine*, *Austin* in *Africa*, *Basil* in *lesser Asia*, and many more. But not to swell the Discourse too largely, I shall onely exhibit two or three Testimonies in distant Ages; of *Clement*, *Ambrose* or his Contemporary, and *Bernard*; after whom this Truth glittered forth in the Confessions of the *Waldenses*, in the Doctrine of *Wickliffe*, and shined forth most gloriously more and more till the great Reformation appeared.

Sculteti Annal. p. 11.

Let's begin with *Clement*, who was *συγχρονος*, *&c.* contemporary with *Peter* and *Paul*, (as *Epiphanius* accounts in his Discourse of the Heresie of the *Carpocrasians*). He in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, speaks directly to this point, [*ὑ δ' ἑαυτῶν δικαιώμεθα, ἢ δι' ἡμετέραν σοφίαν, ἢ συνέσιν, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων, ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆ πίστεως δι' ἧς πάντας τὰς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν. ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Αμὴν.*] *We are not justified by our selves*, nor *by our Wisdom*, *Understanding*, *Piety*, or Works *which we have wrought in Holiness of Heart*; but by Faith, *by which God Omnipotent hath justified all from the beginning* (*of the World*;) *unto whom be Glory for ever and ever. Amen.*

Epiphanii panar. l. 1. T. 2. p. 107. Vol. 1. Edit. Petav. 1622.

Clem. ad *Corinth.* 1 Edit. Jun. p. 41. *Oxon.* 1633.

Let *Ambrose* succeed, who flourish'd at *Millane*, or whoever was Author of those Commentaries, he was coæval to *Damasus*, and was much of the same Age with *Ambrose*; *Bellarmin* judges him to be, *Hilar. Diac. de Script. Eccl.* p. 98. And he declares this expressely on that Text, *Being justified freely by his Grace*: *Quia nihil Operantes, nec vicem reddentes, solâ fide justificati sunt, dono Dei.* They are said to be *freely* justified, because working nothing, nor rendring any Duty or Service, are justified by *Faith alone*; it is *the gift of God*. And this *by Faith alone*, he four times repeats in his Exposition upon the fourth Chapter. Nay *Gratian* in the third part of the *Decretum* cites him thus. *Gratia Dei in Baptismate non requirit gemitum, non planctum vel opus aliquod, sed* solam fidem, *& omnia gratis condonat.* The Grace of God in Baptism requires not Mourning or Lamentation, or any work but *Faith alone*, and he freely forgives all. Where the new Gloss indeed set forth by *Greg.* 13. sayes, that *Gratian* took this citation out of the Ordinary Gloss, not out of *Ambrose* himself, whose words on the 11th to the *Romans* are, *Nisi solam ex corde professionem*, Except a Profession onely from the Heart. Which is true; but it seems hereby, that both *Strabus* the Author of the Gloss, and *Gratian*, took the mind of *Ambrose* more clearly than these new Glossators. For before, *Ambrose* speaks of the *Jews*, their returning to Faith, and after uses these words, *Hoc decrevit ut* solam fidem *poneret per quam omnia peccata abolerentur*: *God decreed this, that he might appoint Faith alone, through which all sins might be abolished.* So that now we have *Ambrose* and *Strabus*, and their own *Gratian*, all agreeing in this Doctrine of Faith alone. Here, though

Rom. 3. 24.

Ambrose Edit. *Paris.* 1569. col. 1819.

Gratian. Decr. part 3. dist. 4. *de Consecr.* c. 95. Edit. *Romæ*, col. 2635. whereby we see *Ambrose* was anciently taken to be the Author of the Commentary.

Ambr. in *Rom.* c. 11 col. 1862.

Trithem. de Script. Eccles. f. 56. b.

these

these Commentaries by some are not judg'd to be genuine to *Ambrose*, yet since they are cited by *Strabus*, and the Synod of *Paris*, *A.* 825. *pag.* 655. and *Gratian*, and urg'd by *Romanists* in their own Cause, they ought not to reject them. For tis a Rule in the Canon-Law, *Quod pro se quis inducit*, &c. What testimony any bring for themselves, they ought not to reject when brought against them, *Dist.* 19. *c. si Romanorum.* However we may put *Hillary* in his room, *in Can.* 8. *in Matth.* expressely. *Fides sola justificat*, That Faith alone justifies, *Ed. Basil.* 1523. *p.* 355.

The next shall be the Testimony of *Bernard*, of *France*, who dyed in the year 1153. who expresses himself thus: *Tam validus ad justificandum, quam multus ad ignoscendum. Quamobrem quisquis pro peccatis compunctus esurit & sitit justitiam, credat in te qui justificas impium, & solam justificatus per fidem pacem habebit ad Deum.* "He is as pow- "erfull to justifie as to multiply pardon. Wherefore, whoever being "under compunction for his Sins, hungers and thirsts after Righteous- "ness, let him believe in thee who justifiest the ungodly, and being justi- "fied *by Faith alone*, he shall have peace with God. And then he proceeds to exhort to Holiness by eying and following of Christ. And otherwhere, *Credens solâ fide hominem posse salvari, cum desiderio percipiendi Sacramentum*, &c. *Si mors anticipet*, &c. "Believing that a "man can be saved *by Faith alone*, with a desire of receiving the Sacra- "ment, *&c.* If Death should prevent, *&c.*

Bern. in Cantic. Serm. 22. f. 130. b.

Isa. 55. 7.

Epist. 77. f. 194. a.

I shall not expend more time with further Allegations of the Ancients, or any particular discussion of these, or of that famous Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, or that other of *Orange*, *c.* 3. & 6. under *Leo* 1. neither shall I recite the Testimony of learned † *Bradwardine*, or the ancient Confessions of Faith set forth by the *Waldenses*. I might shew that this Doctrine hath been held by the faithfull, in all Ages, consonant to the Holy Scriptures: Unto which the Church of *England* hath given a full and ample Attestation, both in her Articles and Homilies: "Who- "ever preaches contrary to these Articles is to be excommunicated, *Canones* 1571. *Tit. Concionatores*, p. 20. Which are the Test and Touchstone of the Soundness of the Members of this Church. Of *the Justification of Man*, the 11th Article: "We are accompted Righte- "ous before God, *onely* for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus "Christ, by Faith, and not for our own Works or Deservings. Where- "fore that we are justified by *Faith onely*, is a most wholsome Doctrine, "and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily "of Justification. If we look then into the Homilies, we finde, that after this Doctrine is asserted, and proved by Scriptures, and several of the Fathers; it's added, "This saying, that we be justified by *Faith one-* "*ly*, freely and without works, as being unable to deserve our Justifica- "tion at Gods hands, *&c.* and therefore wholly to ascribe the Merit and "Deserving of our Justification unto Christ *onely*, and his most precious

An. 418. *Justel. li Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric.* p. 293.

† *De Causâ Dei*, l. 1. c. 43. p. 392.

Canon. 36, 46, 51. *An.* 1604.

Article 11. compos'd 1562. and printed 1571. p. 8.

Book of *Homilies* in the second part of the Sermon of Salvation, *E.* ij. 4to. 1563. & in fol. 1635. p. 16.

"blood-shedding. This Faith, the Holy Scripture teacheth: This is the "strong Rock and Foundation of Christian Religion. This Doctrine "*all* old and *ancient Authors* of Christs Church do approve: This Do- "ctrine advanceth and setteth forth the true glory of Christ, and beateth "down the vain glory of man. This, *whosoever* denyeth, is not to be "compted for a *Christian-man*, not for a setter forth of Christs Glory, "but for an *adversary* to Christ and his Gospel, and for a setter forth of "Mans vain-glory. Blessed be God for this excellent Sermon of the Church of *England*, which all good Christians doe *ex animo* reverence and embrace. To which a person of great Note may well be admitted to bring in a Gloss or Comment. *As for such as hold with the Church of* Rome, *that we cannot be saved by Christ alone, without Works; they do not onely by a circle of Consequence, but directly deny the Foundation of Faith; they hold it not, no not so much as by a Thred.* And again: *That* Faith alone *justifieth, by this speech we never meant to exclude either Hope or Charity from being alwayes joyn'd, as inseparable Mates with Faith* in the Man *that is justified; or Works from being added as necessary Duties required at the hands of every justified man; but to shew that* Faith *is the* onely *hand which putteth on Christ to Justification.* Which agrees with that known saying: *Fides sola* justificat, sed *non solitaria.* Faith stands alone in the Work of Justification, but is alwayes attended with the sanctifying Fruits and Effects of the Spirit of God. And thus *Austin* reconciles *Paul* and *James. August. lib. de diversis quæstionibus, col.* 599. *Tom.* 4. 1569. *Bas.*

Hooker in Discourse of Justification, p. 500. at the end of his *Polity.* 1622.

P. 513.

Now to conclude: What sayes the *Convention* at *Trent* (as *Henry* 2d of *France* term'd it) to this Scriptural and Apostolical Doctrine of the Reformed Churches. Truely, they proceed no higher, than *to curse* such as say, men are Formally justified by the Righteousness of Christ, *i. e.* Essentially, purely, and exclusively; which they explain in the very next *Canon*, and curse them again, who shall say, that men are justified by the *sole imputation* of Christs Righteousness, *&c.* And they curse them again *Can.* 12. that shall say, that *justifying Faith* is nothing else, than a trusting of the Divine Mercy, forgiving sins for Christs sake, *&c.* Nay, they tell us, "It becomes the Divine Clemency not to forgive "us our sins, without any Satisfaction; *i. e.* of Ours. To which they annex a cursing Canon against such as affirm, "That the whole Penalty "is alwayes remitted of God together with the Sin, and that there is no "other Satisfaction of Penitents (required) than Faith, by which they "apprehend Christ to have satisfied for them. By these and the foresaid Testimonies, all may see what is the Doctrine of Holy Scripture, of the Primitive times, and the succeeding Ages of the Church, (which might be abundantly amplified in Testimonies,) and what is the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, and of ours in particular, and what is the Doctrine of the *Romanists*, how opposite, how contradictory. But let us descend to a second inquiry, and that is about a great point of Worship.

Hist. Conc. Trid. l. 4. f. 369.

Sess. 6. *Can.* 10. 11.

Sess. 14. c. 8.

Ib. Can. 12.

II. Con-

II. Concerning the *Worship of God by Images.*

Let us now shew, that the Church of God, consonant to the Holy Scriptures, hath in all Ages given notable testimonies against Idolatry, and the Worship of Images, or of God by Images, as being flatly against the Second Commandment. As *Faith* is that Bond and Ligament which unites the true Church and every living Member thereof, to Christ their Head; so pure Worship is the Honour, and Reverence, and Obedience which the Spouse of Christ renders to her Lord and Husband, who will not communicate his Glory to graven Images. *Idolatry* is compared to *Whoredom* in Scripture, that dissolves the knot of Marriage. God sent a Bill of Divorce for this cause to the ancient external Church of the *Jews*, and expressely upon this account denounces against her, that *she was not his Wife*; and will God (think you) spare any particular Gentile Church, guilty of so fearfull a Crime; having annexed that high Argument of his Jealousie, against such as violate the Second Commandment, and reputing them as haters of him, and whom he will judicially visit with great detestation? Isa. 42. 8. Isa. 50. 1. Jer. 3. 8. Hos. 2. 2.

For the Exhibition of this point, how the true Church of God hath in all Ages held close to the Institutions of chaste and holy Worship, in Spirit and Truth: I might transcribe testimonies out of all the Ancients, that were the Luminaries and Columns of the Primitive Church, down along till *Gregory* the Great, and after his time also many notable and pregnant instances through the very depth of Popery, both of Emperours and Church-men, that did stoutly resist that growing Abomination in the world. I shall, (to avoid prolixity) mention some of the Councils that have determined against this point, and draw to an Issue.

That of *Elvira* neer *Granada* in *Spain*, celebrated *An.* 305. (as *Baronius* thinks) is peremptory in the case, and I shall desire to cite it out of *Agobardus*, because of that his ancient testimony about the year 830. to the truth of this Canon, which runs thus: *Ab orthodoxis patribus definitum est Picturas in Ecclesiâ fieri non debere, nec quod colitur & adoratur in parietibus depingatur.* "It is enjoyned by the Orthodox Fathers, "that Pictures ought not to be in a Church, nor let that be painted on "the Walls, which is to be worshipt and adored. It were vain to spend time, to shew how *Albaspinæus* and others, shift and shuffle about this Canon. Let that good old Bishop of *Lyons*, *Agobardus*, living so many hundred years nearer the time, give his sence upon it: "Let's keep "the Kings High-way; the Apostles, the Masters (or Teachers) of the "Church, they have taught it, *&c.* Let God be adored, worshipt, reve- "renced; let us sacrifice to him alone, either in the Sacrament of the "Body and Blood, or of a contrite Heart, *&c.* Let's look upon a Picture "as a Picture, without Life, Sense and Reason. So likewise, if we see "winged Angels painted, or the Apostles preaching, or the Martyrs "suffering torments, we can hope for no help, *&c.* Wherefore, to avoid "this Superstition, the Orthodox Fathers, did rightly determine, *&c.*] *Concil. Eliberti-num, Can.* 36. & 41. *Baron. An.* 305. *n.* 39. &c. *Agobard. opera, Par.* 1605. *p.* 254. *P.* 251, 252. *P.* 253.

in the Canon aforesaid. The very same is extant in *Ivo*, onely *ne* put for *nec*, and so 'tis read in *Sixtus Senensis* and *Burchardus*: And that *Agobardus* understood this Canon aright, against any Religious Worship to be given to Pictures and Images, he further addes: "Neither "let their deceitfull craftiness run to their old starting holes, to say, that "they do not worship the Images of the Saints, but the Saints themselves, "(*i. e.* by the Images) for God cries out, *I will not give my glory to* "*another, nor my praise to graven Images*, &c. Nay further, so strict were the good Fathers of that Synod aforesaid, that they would not suffer any Idols in their Houses. To conclude, the Authenticalness of this Synod must not be question'd, since several of its Decrees are recited by *Gratian*, whose whole work is confirmed by *Eugenius* the 3d, and by others succeeding, canoniz'd for Church-Law, and the Government of Ecclesiastical Courts.

Ivo. Carnot. decret. l. 3. c. 40. Lovan. 1561. Sixt. Sen. Bibl. l. 5. Annot. 247. Burchard. l. 3. c. 35. p. 85. b. Agobard, p. 254.

As *Trithemius* affirms, *de Script. Eccles.* p. 73. a. and finally by *Greg.* 13. in his *Roman* Edition.

But let their confirmation be how it will, it is a notable testimony against them, even in that Age; and however *Sixtus Senensis* and *Albaspinæus* would evade, as if it were decreed against the Heathens Images and Pictures, as in the 11th Canon of the 12th Council of *Toledo*, that's but a weak shift: for, was it ever known, that the Christians brought the Pictures or Statues of the Heathen Gods into their Churches? No, no; the Fear was of a New kind of Imagery, and of Worshipping of God, and our Lord, and Saints, and Angels, by Representations and Pictures; which at length obtained dreadfully, to the high dishonour of God, contempt of his Commandements, the ruine of the Eastern Empire, and fearfull Judgements on the Western.

‖ *Hoveden Annal.* p. 232. b. *Edit. Lond.* 1596. and *Simeon Dunelm.* col. 111. *Lond.* 1652.

† *Rainold. de Idol. Eccles. Rom.* *Usher.* Answer to the Challenge in *Ireland.* *Mede.* Apostasy of the latter times. *Dailly de Imaginibus.* *Homilies* of the Church of *Engl.* against *the peril of Idolatry.*

It were too long to trace, what direfull stirres and commotions were in the East, about the time of the Second Council of *Nice*, and what excellent testimony was given against it by the Council of *Frankeford*, and the four Books of the Emperour *Charles* the Great, the Synod, *Genetil. ac Parisiens.* &c. and by the Church of *England*, in an Epistle written to *Charles* by *Alcuinus*, in the Name of the Princes and Bishops of our Land, execrating that Idolatry, as ‖ *Hoveden* and *Simeon* of *Durham* testifie: But notwithstanding all Opposition, how it prevailed in every Age, till at last it was finally ratified at *Trent*, and what eminent witness hath been all along raised up by God against it; these things being matter of Fact and Story, would rise to a just Treatise, and many things relating to it, being amply handled by † *Reynolds*, *Usher*, *Mede*, and *Dailly*, *&c.* famous in their Generations, who have skilfully handled the Sword taken from behind the Ephod. I shall come to a close of this Paragraph, onely recommend to your diligent Reading, those excellent Homilies of the Church of *England*, against the *Peril of Idolatry*; which if well read and digested, I hope by divine blessing may prove a Soveraign Antidote against the creeping Cancer of *Romish Idolatry*. But I suppose this will be the Subject of a compleat Position among these Exercises, and therefore at present shall enlarge no further. And now let us

hasten

haſten to ſome Inferences or Concluſions flowing from this Text and Point, of *Chriſt* being the onely *Foundation* of his Church, enduring throughout all Ages, united to him by their moſt holy *Faith*, and adhering to him by holy and pure *Worſhip*.

I. From what has been hitherto treated of, we may learn which is the *true Church of Chriſt*, and where it hath ſubſiſted and been preſerved in all Ages, and how to diſcern and know it, and the true Members thereto belonging, *viz.* By its being built upon *Chriſt* alone, the firm Rock and Baſis of its Conſtitution. Such are to be owned for Living Members, who acknowledge Chriſt, the Son of the Living God, to be the true and onely Head of the Church; ſuch as are built upon Chriſt, and the Doctrine of the holy Apoſtles and Prophets; Such as adhere to the Scriptures, and receive and refuſe things as they are proved or rejected by Scripture: to whom both *Peter*, and *Paul*, and *James*, and all the Apoſtles writings are equally precious: that dare not advance Humane Traditions, into a parity of Honour with the Divine Writings of Scripture, dictated by the Spirit of God; which teaches by what Notes and Characters to diſcern the true Church of God: (Not like thoſe abominable Wretches, who finding *Paul* ſo directly level'd againſt them, thought of cenſuring his Epiſtle as favouring of Hereſie, and the Author for a hot-headed perſon:) That tremble at ſuch Devices, and dare not try the Church by glorious and pompous Viſibility, Univerſality, and continual ſucceſſion of Biſhops in one place; looking upon them as falſe and counterfeit Notes: But by pure Scripture Doctrine, by Sacraments rightly adminiſtred, by Adherence to Chriſt alone for Righteouſneſs and Juſtification in the ſight of God, by Spiritual and Scriptural Worſhip, and ſuch like. We deny not, but firmly hold, that the true Church of Chriſt hath been alwayes *in ſome meaſure* Viſible. *Viſibilis, licet non omnibus viſa.* Capable of being ſeen and known by ſuch whoſe Eyes are anoynted by Scripture Eye-ſalve. Indeed if that were true which we find in the *Roman* Catechiſme ſet forth by the Authority of *Trent*, concerning that Article in the Creed about the Church: Præcipuè *in hoc articulo, Eccleſia bonorum ſimul & malorum multitudinem*, &c. *ſignificat*. That *the Church* in this Article doth *principally* ſignifie the multitude both of good and evil: Then indeed there might be ſome tolerable Plea for the Splendor and Perſpicuity of the Church in moſt Ages. But when we conſider the ſharp Perſecutions raiſed againſt the Apoſtles and the Primitive Church by the *Jews*, and againſt their Succeſſors by the *Gentile Pagan* Empire, ſo fierce and terrible, that *Dioclefian* doubted not to erect Columns of Triumph over Chriſtianity, among the *Arevacæ* in *Spain*; which ſome take to be remembred in *Arevacco* neer *Madrid*, with theſe Inſcriptions, *Nomine Chriſtianorum deleto*; and in another, *Superſtitione Chriſti ubique deletâ. ſc.* The Name of Chriſt being extinct, and the Superſtition of Chriſt being every where aboliſht: Or when

1 *Corollary.*

Eph. 2. 20.

Sir *Edw. Sands Survey of the Religion in the Weſt*, p. 116. *Edit. Lond.* 1637.

Catechiſm. Rom. p. 79. *Ant.* 1591.

Occones Numiſm. 4to. *adi Heracl. Ant.* 1579.

when we reflect upon the *Apostasie*, the Violence of the *Arians* against the sincere Embracers of the holy Doctrine of *Peter*, That *Christ was the Eternal Son of the Living God*, and so notably determined by the first Council of *Nice*: Or when we call to mind the astonishing Tragedies, acted by the *Papal* Power for about 1200 years, against such as have kept close to the same Apostolical Faith and Purity of Worship; We may well take up the *Threnodia*, or Lamentations of the Apostle, concerning the Church under the *Syrian* Princes: Heb. 11. 37. *They wandred about in Sheep-skins, and Goat-skins, &c. of whom the world was not worthy; They wandred in Desarts and Mountains, in Dens and Caves of the Earth.* True is that of *Hillary*; That the Church did meet with the Apostles, *intra cœnacula & secreta*, in chambers and secret places: *Hilarius contr. Auxentium, p. 282.* Who afterwards sighing out his complaints against the *Arians*; *Malè Ecclesiam Dei in Tectis Ædificiisque reveramini*: You do ill to reverence the Church of God in stately Buildings, *&c. Montes mihi & Sylvæ & Lacus sunt tutiores*: I count the Mountains, Woods and Marshes to be more safe: *P. 286.* And as the Gloss cites him, *Potius in Cavernis Ecclesiam delitescere, quàm in primariis sedibus eminere.* That the Church is rather to be found lying hid in secret Caverns, than to be eminently conspicuous in principal Sees. *Gloss.*

But not to heap up witnesses; the testimony of the Church of *England*, in that notable Homily against the *Peril of Idolatry*, may suffice once for all, out of *Eusebius* and *Austin*. *Homily*, part 3. p. 72. b. 4to, "That when Christian Religion was most pure, and indeed *golden*, Christians had but low and "poor *Conventicles*, and simple Oratories, and Caves under ground "called *cryptæ*; where they (for fear of Persecution) assembled secretly "together. And so it hath continued more or less during the Papal Dominion, according to the Prophecy, That *the Woman*, i. e. the *Church*, Rev. 12. 6, 14. should recede into a Wilderness-state for 1260 years from the taking up of *Constantine* into Heaven.

The true Church of Christ, consisting of all its Members, (the greater part whereof is Triumphant in Heaven, and the rest Militant upon Earth, on which account onely is it to be genuinely called *Catholick*,) cannot properly be styled *Visible* to the Eye of *Sense*, but (according to our ancient Creed) to the Eye of *Faith*. We believe there is such a Church, all whose true Members are certainly and onely known to God. For what Eagle-sighted Angel can search the Heart, and positively determine the truth of Faith in that sealed Fountain, whereby the Heart flowes out in streams of Love unto Christ? Against such a Soul, against a Society composed of such heavenly Members, against such a Church, the Gates of Hell shall never prevail. But against a catholick, external, visibly glorious Church, the Gates of Hell have so far prevailed in many Ages, that she hath been reduced into a very low and gloomy Estate; as she was in the Vision of *Zechary*, when the Man riding upon a red Horse, stood still among the Myrtle-trees that were in the bottome, by night. Zech. 1. 8.

Our

Ep. of Cov. & Lich. *Grand Imposture*, p. 9.

2 Tim. 2. 19.

Our Lord promises the Churches Existeney, and its perennial Duration, throughout all Ages, and his own presence among his Myrtle-trees, in a dark bottome, and his walking among his golden Candle-sticks in the deep Night of Adversity, but not its Glory and and Perspicuity; not Triple Crowns, and Eminencies. *Peter* never came forth shining with precious Stones, and glistering in Silks, and overlaid with Gold, and prancing on a white Palfry, guarded with *Swizzers*, and hemm'd in with a crowd and Noyse of Servants; as *Bernard* accosts *Eugenius* the 4th, telling him, In these he succeeded the Imperial *Constantine*, and not *Peter*. Our Lord never promised such Glory and Splendor; those fine things become another kind of Creature in the *Revelations*. *Bern. de Cons. ad Eug. l. 4. f. 142. b.* Rev. 18, 15.

The true Church hath usually been as indigent of Silver and Gold as the true *Peter*; yet hath been preserved in all Ages from Extremity and Ruine. Some particular Churches, some members of the true and invisible catholick Church, whereof Christ is the Head, have been alwayes marching along the howling Wilderness of this World toward *Canaan*. The Church hath been most while in a troublous and desert Estate, few *Elims* of Palm-trees to sit under, or Fountains in which to wash her sacred Eyes; yet as to Purity of Worship, and the Food of Heavenly *Manna*, she hath alwayes enjoy'd some *Moses's*, some Pastors to feed her in the Wilderness, such as have Prophesied to her all along. Her Faith in Christ, and chaste Love to him, hath been clearly discerned by none but his holy Eye; especially in times of general defection from the Truths of God, when as to her secret Communion in Ordinances, none but such whose Eyes are clarified in the Chrystal streams of holy Scripture, have been able to discern her. But there have been some few times, when very *Balaams* having climbed up into the Mountain of Contemplation, and stood upon a Prophetical Rock, and looking toward *this* Wilderness, have cried out in an Extasie, upon a sight of the glorious beauty of the Church, *How goodly are thy Tents, O Jacob, and thy Tabernacles, O Israel! as Gardens by the Rivers side, as the Trees of Lign-aloes, which the Lord hath planted, as Cedar-trees besides the Waters.* The Church hath been alwayes visible *in se*; God hath left no Age without a witness of the pure Word dispens'd, of the two Sacraments duely administred, and of Spiritual Worship and Order managed in a comely Apostolical manner, without the garish dresses of Humane Fancies, and Institutions; which are the onely proper Notes, Marks and Characters, where the true Church hath been and is, and where the faithfull Pastors are to be found, who stand in the *Counsel of God*. But who can help, if blind men cry out, they see her not; or such as want the Optick glass of Scriptures, and call for a gay, splendid, sensual Appearance of glittering and costly Ceremonies? whose Ears fill'd with Temple Musick, their Eyes ravish'd with stately Pictures and *Babylonian* Images pourtrayed with Vermilion, and their Nostrils perfumed with the rich Odours of *Arabia*, cry out *Templum Domini, The Temple of the Lord is here.* Act. 3. 6. Rev. 12. 6. 11. 3. Numb. 24. 2, 5, 6. Jer. 23. 22. Ezek. 23. 14.

Was

Was not *Nebuchadnezzars* Image dedicated with great glory, set off with Consorts of Musick, and attended with numerous Worshippers? Alas, this universal consent, grand Acclamations, copious Assemblies, uninterrupted Successions in mitred Habits, Splendour, and Pomp, and Grandeur, are not the tokens of his Kingdom which cometh not with Observation, or as *Agrippa* and *Bernice*, μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας, with stately and splendid Presence. *Heathenisme* and *Turcisme* may plead for a Suffrage in such cases. Christs Flock is a *little* Flock; *In this World ye shall have tribulation*, sayes our Lord; and in *many tribulations we must enter into the Kingdom of God.*

Luk. 17. 20. Act. 25. 23. Luk. 12. 32. Joh. 16. 33. Act. 14. 22.

Now here I might, out of several ancient Records and Monuments, shew the Succession of some parts of the true Church of Christ in *France*, in the *Alpine* Valleys, and in *Britain*, and elsewhere in the East; where true Doctrine, (and for the main, true Discipline and Worship) hath been preserved all along, though secretly for the most part, and not with External Glory and Splendor: But that would infringe upon the dispatch of the remaining Corollaries.

2 *Corollary.* II. This Text, and Doctrine thence deduced, discovers all *false pretending Churches*, from the *true*: such as lay any other Foundation than Christ the Son of God; such as *hold not the Head*; such as build not upon the Doctrinal Foundation of the holy Apostles and Prophets, cannot be true Churches of Christ. Let good *Hilary* be Judge; *Quisquis Christum*, qualis *ab Apostolis est praedicatus, negavit, Antichristus est.* He is the Antichrist whoever denies Christ, *qualis* such as he is preached by the Apostles. Then such as are departed from the Doctrine of the Apostles in Fundamental Points, are counted by *Hilary*, Antichristian Societies. To him we may adjoyn holy *Austin*: *Mendax est Antichristus, qui ore profitetur Jesum esse Christum, & factis negat. Opera loquuntur, & verba requirimus? Ideo mendax quia aliud loquitur, aliud agit. Quis enim malus non bene vult loqui?* Antichrist is a Lyar, who professes Jesus to be the Christ with his mouth, and denies him in deeds. therefore a Lyar, because he speaks one thing and does another. The Works speak, and do we require Words? For what evil man will not speak well. And again: *Quare ab Arianis, Eunomianis, Macedonianis, confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse*, &c. *Quid ergo facimus? unde discernimus*, &c? *Nec nos negamus, nec illi negant*, &c. *invenimus factis negare:* Ask of *Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians*; they confess Jesus Christ to be come in the flesh, &c. what shall we do then? how shall we discern him? neither we nor they deny it; we finde that they deny him in deeds: As the Apostle saith of such, *They profess to know God, but in works they deny him. Quaeramus in factis, non in linguis.* Let's seek it in their works, and not in their tongues. If we examine their Creeds, they profess to believe all the Articles, and more too; but yet in all his three Offices they evacuate the truth of their pretended Credence, as the ‖ learned have abundantly evinced: Which being true,

Col. 2. 19. *Hilar. contr. Auxent.* p. 282. *Augustin. in Ep. Joh. Tract.* 3. *Tom.* 9. p. 598. *Id. Tract.* 6. p. 623. Tit. 1. 16. ‖ *Rainolds, Whitaker, Sharp, Crakanthorp, Wotton*, &c.

true, then their own rule in the Canon-Law condemns them: *Certum est quod is committit in legem, qui legis verba complectens, contra legis nititur voluntatem:* It's certain, that he treſpaſſes againſt the Law, who embracing the words of the Law, practiſes againſt the mind of the Law. For by their *traditions* they have made the *commandments* of God of none effect. So true is that which *Ambroſe*, or ſome Ancient under his name, thunders againſt ſuch; *Quicquid non ab Apoſtolis traditum eſt, ſceleribus plenum eſt:* Whatever is not delivered by the Apoſtles, is full of wickedneſſes. But before we enter the particulars of this Enquiry, we muſt conclude, that the queſtion in hand ought not to be determined by particular Doctors of this or that Communion. It is not what an *Eraſmus*, or a *Caſſander*, or an *Eſpencæus*, or *Ferus*, do teach; nor what a *Bellarmine*, a *Stapleton*, a *Scioppius*, a *Pighius*, nor what the *Spaniſh* Divines in ſome caſes at *Trent*, or the *French* Divines in point of Supremacy, and defence of the *Pragmatical Sanction*; nor wherein the *Thomiſts* and *Scotiſts*, the *Dominicans* and *Jeſuites*, do conflict: That were an incongruous method, either to diſcern their minds by, or to accommodate any *Syncretiſmes*, or fallacious *Unions*: Theſe are but perſonal Opinions, they'l ſtand to none of their Doctors. But what Councils and Authorized Aſſemblies, what Confeſſions and Catechiſmes, compoſed by their direction and warranty, have determined; there lyes the Rule of Enquiry, and therefore I ſhall here touch upon no Authorities or Citations, but ſuch as are found in the Canon-Law, the Council and Catechiſm of *Trent*, their Miſſals, Bulls, and Determinations from the Chair. As for others, but *obiter & per tranſennam*, as collateral proofs, or confirm'd by Papal Edicts; or ſuch Authors as have paſs'd the tryal of their Purging Indexes, ſet out by their own Authority. Let's then proceed to ſome Enquiries in this Affair.

Reg. Jur. 88. 6 Decretal. E 5.

Mat. 15. 6.

Ambroſ. in 1 Cor. 4. col. 1892.

(1.) Is that a true Church of Chriſt that determines Fundamental Doctrines contrary to Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that builds upon another Foundation than Chriſt? That they have aſſumed *Peter* for the onely Head of the Militant Church, might be abundantly proved: Inſomuch, that if Princes and Emperours doe but perform their duty as keepers of both Tables, how greatly are they offended? As when *Charles* 5. took to himſelf ſome Spiritual Juriſdiction, how does *Baronius* exclaim, as if he ſet up another Head of the Church, *pro monſtro & oſtento*, as a portentuous Monſter; which might with much more truth be retorted upon themſelves in reſpect to our Lord, whom they rob of his Glory when they aſcribe it to *Peter*. Let but *Peter* be impriſoned by *Agrippa*, how does the ſame *Baronius* cry out, *Magno ſane terræmotu Eccleſia Chriſti tunc concuti viſa eſt, cum ipſa Petra in Eccleſia fundamento locata, tanta agitatione quaſſari conſpicerentur*: The Church of Chriſt truely then ſeem'd to be ſhaken with a great Earth-quake, when the very Rock placed in the Foundation of the Church, was ſeen to be ſo ſorely ſhaken. It ſeems *Peter* was the Rock placed by Chriſt for the Foun-

Baron. ad Ann. 1097. n. 28.

Ann. 44. n. 3.

Foundation of the Church; But let's look a little further. *Clemens* in his first Epistle to *James* the Brother of our Lord, written to him after the Apostle was dead, (as the learned *Crakanthorp* hath proved,) which is set forth at *Basil*, and by *Turrian* and others, and is extant in the first Tome of the Councils, and ratified by the Canon-Law, which speaks thus: *Simon Petrus*, &c. *vera Fidei merito, & integra Prædicationis obtentu, fundamentum esse Ecclesiæ definitus est: Simon Peter* by the merit of his true Faith, and having obtained it by his sincere preaching, is defined to be the Foundation of the Church. The Divinity transcends the Latin in Barbarisme; But it seems by the Forger, that it was our Lords doing, consonant to after Popes asserting the same, "That *he* com-"mitted to *Peter*, the blessed Key-keeper of Eternal Life, the Laws "both of the Earthly and Heavenly Empire. And again, treating of *Peter*; *Hunc in consortium individuæ unitatis assumptum, id quod ipse erat voluit nominari, dicendo, Tu es Petrus, &c. ut æterni ædificatio Templi, mirabili munere gratiæ Dei in Petri soliditate consisteret:* This person being taken into fellowship of individual Unity, (*O fearfull!*) he would have him called that which he was, saying, *Thou art Peter, &c.* that the building of the Eternal Temple might consist in the solidity of *Peter*, by the wonderfull gift of the Grace of God. This needs no Gloss. But the learned Glossators upon the common Extravagants, after they have expounded *Cephas* to signifie a *Head*, they proceed: *Sicut in corpore materiali est ponere caput unum, in quo sunt omnes sensus seu plenitudo sentiendi: Sic in Ecclesiâ militante (ne sit tanquam corpus monstruosum, si duo haberet capita) est tantum ponere unum caput*, viz. *Rom. Pontificem, in quo est plenitudo potestatis, & auctoritatis*, &c. As in a material Body there is but one Head placed, in which are all the Senses, or a fulness of Sensation; so in the Church militant, (lest it should be like a monstrous Body, if it have two heads) there is but one Head placed, *viz.* the *Roman* Bishop; in whom is the Fulness of Power and Authority. And *Boniface* 8th, *in Extrav. Comm. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *de Majorit. Igitur Ecclesiæ unius & unicæ, unum corpus, unum caput, non duo capita, quasi monstrum, Christus*, viz. *& Christi Vicarius, Petrus, Petrique Successor*, &c. Therefore, of the one onely Church, one Body, one Head, not two Heads, like a *Monster*, *sc.* Christ and *Peter*, Christ's Vicar and *Peters* Successors. By these Doctrines we are now clearly illuminated, that as to the influence and Government of the militant Church, Christ hath excluded himself from Headship, lest the Body should be monstrous, with two Heads. Such fearfull and tremendous points are taught South of the Mountains. But the truth is, they speak of themselves, and seek their own Glory; and not Christs, whose Commandments they have annulled and evacuated by their many Additions to and Substractions from his. They would seem indeed to retain all, onely adde some; but whosoever addes as well as detracts, is lyable to the Curse of God: for hereby they stain the Glory of the Divine Law, as insuffi-

Crakanthorp Connects p. 422. *Basil.* 1526. *Turrian Paris*, 1568. f. 326. *Dist.* 80. c. 2. f. 307. & *Caus.* 6. q. 1. c. 5. & *caus.* 25. q. 1. c. 13. & 15. *Edit. Rom.*

Dist. 20. c. 1. p. 130.

Dist. 19 c. 7. p. 110. *Edit. Rom.* 1. 82.

Extrav. l. 5. c. 1. p. 345. *Rom. Edit.*

Joh. 7. 18.

Deut. 12. 32. *Prov.* 30. 6. *Rev.* 22. 18. *Gal.* 1. 8.

insufficient and imperfect, and more especially when they adde Fundamental Points upon peril of Damnation; when they frame new Articles of Faith, as Pope *Pius* the 4.th hath done. Articles are Principles, and therefore indemonstrable, except by Scripture: Now when new ones are added, *de fide*, extraneous to the holy Scriptures, nay repugnant in such mighty and weighty matters, can any man alive, that is not deep in the golden Cup, sedately believe the true Church of Christ to be there; When, 1. They require firm Faith in the Traditions, Observations, and Constitutions of the Church of *Rome*: And, 2. Tye all Churches to *their* sence of the Scriptures: And, 3. To hold Seven Sacraments to be instituted by Christ: And, 4. The *Trent* Doctrine about Justification: 5. The Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Mass: 6. Transubstantiation: 7. Purgatory: 8. Invocation of Saints: 9. Adoration of Images: 10. Indulgences: 11. The *Roman* Church to be Mistress of all Churches, and the Bishop thereof Christs Vicar: 12. And all things in the Canons and Councils, but especially of *Trent*; and in the conclusion, *Hanc veram catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*, &c. *profiteor & veraciter teneo*, &c. You must profess and truely hold this to be the true *catholick Faith*, without which none can be saved.

Art. 2. Bull. *Pii* 4. *super forma jurand. emit. professionis fidei.*

But for the easing of mens Minds in these and the like particulars, they cry up the Immensity of their Power, and Priviledge, to dispense with Scripture and Apostolical Doctrine. Indeed there's great need *that* should be well proved; and the Canon-Law has done the deed. For in the first place, It is pronounced *ex Cathedrâ*, from the very Chair of *Peter*; *Subesse Romano Pontifici omnem humanam creaturam, declaramus, dicimus, diffinimus & pronunciamus, omninò esse de necessitate salutis*: Pope *Boniface* the 8 h. hath very well expres'd it in his definitive Sentence: "We declare, affirm, determine, and pronounce, that it is "altogether *necessary to Salvation*, that every humane creature be sub-"ject to the Pope of *Rome*. Is not this Doctrine wonderfull clear in Holy Scriptures, and obvious in every Page? But lest we should mistake the places, we shall be help'd out with some dispensations as to Scripture.

Extrav. Com. l. 1. c. 1. de Major. & Obed. p. 212. Romæ, & Quicquid salvatur, est sub summo Pontifice. *Ib. Gloss.* col. 205.

The Gloss upon Pope *Nicholas* his Rescript to the Bishops of *France*, expressely sayes, *Contra Apostolum dispensat*; That he may dispense against the Apostle, and against Natural Right. And again, upon an Edict of Pope *Martins*; *Sic ergo. Papa dispensat contra Apostolum*: So then, the Pope dispenses against the Apostle. And *Greg.* 13. addes a Note out of *Aquinas*, *Non est absurdum quoad jus positivum*: It is not absurd as to a positive Law. And again, *Secundum plenitudinem potestatis de jure possumus supra jus dispensare*: Where the Gloss addes, *Nam contra Apostolum dispensat, & contra Canones Apostolorum: Item contra Vetus Testamentum in Decimis*: According to fulness of Power, we can of Right dispense above or beyond Right? For he dispenses against the Apostle, and against the Canons of the Apostles, and against

Caus. 15. 9. q. 6. c. 2. Rom. col. 1442.

Dist. 14. c. 12. p. 230.

Decretal. l. 3. Tit. 8. c. 4. col. 1074.

Mat. 5. 32. & 19. 9. *Caus.* 32. *q.* 7. *c.* 18. *col.* 2156. Rom. 12. 17. Mat. 5. 39. *Sext. decretal. Tit.* 11. *c.* 6. *p.* 717. *Dist.* 82. *c.* 5. *col.* 529.

the Old Testament, in Tithes. Our Lord determines Marriage not to be dissolved, but in case of Whoredom; but *Greg.* 3. orders, If a Wife be infirm, *ad debitum*, then *jugalis nubat magis*, let her Husband marry rather, *qui non potest continere*. Our Lord teaches, not to *resist evil*, but *Innocent* 4th teaches, *Vim vi repellere, & utcunque gladium, &c. alterum altero adjuvare*; To resist force with force, and help out one Sword with another. I might shew it in the case of Oaths and Vows, and several others, as, If a Priest commit Fornication, though by the Canons of the Apostles he ought to be deposed, yet by the Authority of *Sylvester*, let him doe Penance for ten years, *&c.* But enough of this.

Let's proceed to shew their Power in the point of Subtractions, in some particulars.

First, As to the Holy *Scriptures*, let's observe several points.

1. They substitute the Vulgar *Latin* Translation to be the Authentick Word of God, instead of the Original Hebrew and Greek: Of which an Author of their own attests, That the *Roman* Church permits not the Scriptures but in Lattin. But we need no further witness than the Sanction of *Trent*, which appoints and declares, That the Old Vulgar Edition, *&c.* should be used for the Authentical, in publick Lectures, Disputes, Preachings, and Expositions, and that none dare or presume to reject it upon any pretense.

Hist. of *Cardinals*, *p.* 4.

Sess. 4.

2. The Common People are not to read them. Indeed *Pius* 4th, in the fourth Rule for the managing of the purging Indexes of Books prohibited according to the appointment of *Trent*, grants to read them, if translated by *catholick* Authors, and leave had from the Priest or Confessor, else not. Since as they say, *Si passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri*. If they be commonly permitted without distinction, more detriment rises than profit, through the rashness of men. But in *Clement* the 8th, his observation on that fourth Rule, this facu'ty or license of reading or retaining vulgar Bibles, is wholly taken away, and concludes, *Quod quidem inviolatè servandum est*, Which is to be kept inviolably.

Index libr. prohib. Reg. 4.

Obs. in Reg. 4. *Rhotun.* 1640. *ad calcem Concil. Trident.*

3. They must be received and understood according to the sence of the *Roman* Church: *Cujus est judicare de vero sensu & interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum*; In whose Authority it is, to judge of the sence and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. It's said of *Avecroes*, that he anoynted *Avicens* Books with Poyson, in design upon him; and what cause we have to fear the like from their Commentaries, let the Learned judge. But besides, since the *Lateran* Decree of the Popes Superiority to a Council, we are in the dark what their Church is; but *Paul* the Second expounded it to poor *Platina*, as himself relates. *Torvis oculis me aspiciens*, &c. *ac si nescires omnia jura in Scrinio pectoris nostri collocata esse, sic stat Sententia; loco cedant omnes, eant quo volunt, nihil eos moror;*

Concil. Trid. Sess. 4. & *Pii* 2. *Bulla super form. juram. profess. fidei, Art.* 2.

Platina in Paul 2. *f.* 336. *a. Edit. Par.* 1505.

moror; *Pontifex sum, mihique licet, pro arbitrio animi, aliorum acta & rescindere et approbare*: Let it be English'd by the Abbots Version; "Know ye not that I am infallible, and carry all their Judgements and "Reasons in the Cabinet of my Breast. I consider no mans Person, I am "Pope, and 'tis in my Power to null or confirm their Acts, as I think good "my self. This case is manifest. *Hist. Cardinals*, p. 122.

4. They equal the *Canons* and Traditions to the *Scriptures*: *Pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ suscipit et veneratur*. They receive and reverence the one with equal pious affection as the other: And for this in the Canon-Law we have ample testimony. All the Sanctions of the Apostolical Seat, are to be received, as if confirmed by the Voyce of holy *Peter* himself; and although the yoke imposed by that holy Seat, be scarce tolerable, yet let us bear and endure it with a pious Devotion: And if any man sin against them, *Noverit sibi veniam denegari*, Let him know, that pardon shall be denyed him. Again, *Nulli fas est, vel velle, vel posse transgredi Apostolicæ sedis præcepta*: It is lawfull for none, so much as to *will*, much less to be *able* to transgress the Precepts of the Apostolical Chair. Again, The Popes Decretal Epistles are expressely reckoned among Canonical Scriptures. *Inter quas sane illæ sint quas Apostolica sedes habere, et ab ea alii meruerunt accipere Epistolas*: Among which surely those Epistles are to be, which the Apostolical Seat receives, and which others have deserved to receive from thence. Further, the Violation of Canons they state it to be Blasphemy, and a sin against the Holy Ghost. Nay, as to some Discipline, and the ancient Institution of Christian Religion, *Tantâ Reverentiâ apicem Apostolicæ sedis omnes suspiciunt, ut magis*, &c. *ab ore præcessoris ejus quàm à sacris paginis*, &c. *expetant*, &c. With such Reverence do all look up to the Pinacle of the Apostolical Seat, that they *rather* receive from the Mouth of his Predecessor, than from the holy Scriptures. So that the matter may well be reduced to the Edict of the *Jesuites* at *Dole*, mentioned by Sir *Edw. Sands*, having thus effectually deprived the People of the holy Scriptures; to avoid all further contests and troubles in Religion, forbid any talk of God either in good sort or bad. Thus we must bid adieu to holy Scriptures, and (as one sayes) embrace their holy Trumperies. For if any man desire to know which is the true Church; how should he know it but *one'y* by the Scripture. *Auth. Op. Imperfect. in Matth. Hom.* 49.

Trident. Sess. 4. *Dist.* 19. *c.* 2. & *c.* 3. *col.* 106. *Dist.* 19. *c.* 1. *col.* 135. *Dist.* 19. *c.* 5. *col.* 109. & *Ivo. Epist.* 8. *Par.* 1610. & *Synod. Rem.* p. 47. *Francof.* 1600. *Dist.* 19. *c.* 6. *col.* 107. *Caus.* 25. *q.* 1. *c.* 5. *col.* 1897. *Dist.* 40. *c.* 6. *col.* 259. Sir *Edw. Sands* Survey of Relig. in the *West*, p. 231.

Secondly, They take away the *Cup* in the *Lords Supper* from the Christian People, and that with a *Non-obstante*. *Licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, &c.* Although Christ did after Supper ordain, and administer to his Disciples in both the Elements of Bread and Wine, this Venerable Sacrament, *tamen hoc non obstante*, yet nevertheless, the Authority of Sacred Canons, the laudable and approved custom of the Church, hath kept and doth keep, *&c. & habenda est pro Lege*, they pass it into a Law, to communicate in one kind, and pronounce such to be

Concil. Constant. Sess. 13. f. 515. *Gratian.* 2.

be dealt with as Hereticks, that oppose this new Law made in defiance of Christ, and the Primitive Church. What a Church is this, that puts a Barre to Christ! Pray resolve how blessed and obedient a Spouse this is.

Mat. 19. 5,6. 1 Cor. 7. 2. 1 Tim. 3. 2. & 4. 7. Heb. 13. 4.

Thirdly, Though our blessed Lord and his Apostles, commend *Marriage* as the Institution of God, and honourable among all, and the forbidding of it repulsed, as the Doctrine of Devils; yet there s founder Advice it seems to be found in the Canon-Law: "Priests Marriage is "not forbid by the Authority of Law or Gospel, or of the Apostles, *Ec-* "*clesiastica tamen lege penitus interdicitur*, yet by Ecclesiastical Law it "is utterly forbidden. And they may commit Fornication, and not be deposed, and their gloss gives this satisfying Reason, *Quia hodiè fragiliora sunt corpora nostra quam olim erant*; Because our Bodies are now adayes more frail than they were of old: And though, to take a second Wife, *Secundum præceptum Apostoli est*, That's but according to the Præcept of the Apostle, *Secundum veritatis autem rationem verè Fornicatio est*; Yet according to the account of Truth, verily it is Fornication: *Sed dum permittente Deo publicè et licenter committitur, fit honesta Fornicatio*; But when it is publickly † committed, and with license, by the permission of God, it becomes *honest fornication*. And for Adultery it's counted among the lesser crimes. *De adulteriis verò et aliis criminibus, quæ sunt minora.* A Bishop may dispense with his Clerks. More of the like stuffe may be read in *Pelagius* his Rescript to the Bishop of *Florence*, and Reason rendred, *Quia corpora ipsa hominum defecerunt*; Because the very Bodies of men are grown weak. And if a Clerk embrace a Woman, it's to be expounded to bless her, *caus.* 11. *q.* 3. *c.* 14. *col.* 1223. But for these and the like cases, the Tax of the Apostolical Chancery gives the richest Reasons, where any thing is dispens'd with for Money: A Book wherein (saith *Espenceus*) thou may'st learn more wickedness than in all the *Summists* and Summaries of all Vices; set forth in the dayes of Pope *Leo* the 10th, who made that infamous Reply to Cardinal *Benbus*, *Quantum nobis ac nostro cœtui profuit ea de Christo fabula, satis est sæculis omnibus notum.* It's known well enough to all Ages, how much that Fable of Christ hath benefited us and our Society. Well might the Abbot of *Ursberg* cry out, *Gaude mater nostra Roma*, &c. Rejoyce, O *Rome*, our Mother, for the Cataracts of Treasures are opened in the Earth, that Rivers of Money may flow in to thee: Rejoyce over the iniquity of the Sons of men, for thou receivest the price for a Recompence of such great wickedness.

† *Licenter*] *quia pœnam temporalem non patiebantur.* Because they suffered not temporal punishment. *Gloss. ibid.*

Decretal. l. 2. de Judic. c. 4. col. 523.

Dist. 34. c. 7. col. 125.

Espence. in Tit. cap. 1. digr. 2. p. 67. Edit. Par. 1568. and the *Cent. m gravamina in Fascic. rerum.* 178.

Rambin Review of *Trent.* p. 79.

Valera, of the Lives of Popes p. 150. out of *P. Jovius.*

Urspeg Chron. p. 335 Argentor. 1609.

Fourthly, For Prohibition of Meats. Whereas the Apostle tells us, *Whatever is sold in the Shambles, that eat, asking no question for Conscience sake*; and *let no man judge you in meat or drink.* For God hath created them to be *received with thanksgiving*, of them which believe, and know the truth, and *nothing to be refused.* Such as believe in God, and are acquainted with the truth of his holy Word, make no scruple,

1 Cor. 10. 25. Col. 2. 16. 1 Tim. 4. 3, 4.

as

as those who *speak Lies in Hypocrisie*, and are seducing Spirits. But the Canon-Law commands Fastings, as a tenth part of time consecrated to God out of the whole year, and against our eating of Flesh, assigns a pregnant citation out of the Apostle; *Bonum est Vinum non bibere & carnes non comedere:* It's good not to drink Wine, nor to eat Flesh. But the connext words are left out, which referre to Offence in the Primitive times. But I shall not further touch this point: their Precepts and Practices stand opposite to the Holy Scriptures; but how wholsom to the Body to appoint their grand Fasts, and abstinence from Flesh, in the Spring, let *Fuchsius* a learned Physician be Judge, out of *Soranus* and *Hippocrates*. *Quod verno tempore minimè sit jejunandum*: We ought least of all to fast in the Spring-time. And after he hath urg'd his Argument, he closes; *Romanum Pontificem non solum esse* Antichristum, *&c.* That the *Roman* Bishop is not onely Antichrist, in stating a Doctrine contrary to Christ, but *Atiatrum*, contrary to Physicians; to appoint a Fast *then*, and forbid flesh; when they have unanimously taught, we ought to eat more largely, and abstain from Fish. But it became the Man of Perdition, not onely to destroy our Souls but our Bodies also, by his Decrees, and our Purses also, (imitating *Peter* in fishing for Money at the Sea of *Galilee*, *Matt.* 17. 27.) we must buy of him leave at that time to eat Milk, and the like Viands.

1 Tim. 4. 1, 2.

Dec. 3 part. de Consecr. dist. 5. c. 16. col. 1671.

Dist. 35. c. 2. col. 231.

Fuchs. Institit. Medicin. lib. 2. sect. 2. cap. 9.

But to finish this Paragraph; of such a Society as adde to, subtract from, dispense with, and over-rule the Laws of God; what should all the sober and pious judge, but what the Scripture hath Prophetically decipher'd them to be, and what the Church of *England* hath determined concerning them; that since they have forsaken, and daily doe forsake the Commandments of God, to erect and set up their own Constitutions, we may well conclude, according to the Rule of *Augustine*, that the Bishops of *Rome*, and their adherents, are *not the true Church of Christ*, much less then to be taken as chief Heads and Rulers of the same. Whosoever, saith he, do dissent from the Scriptures concerning the Head, although they be found in all places, where the Church is appointed, yet are they not in the Church. A plain place, concluding directly against the Church of *Rome*.

Homilie of the Church of *England*, in the 2d part of the Sermon for *Whit-Sunday*, 4to. f. 229. b.

(2) Is that the true Church of Christ, that *pollutes* the *Worship* of God by *Idolatry?* Why is this Sin so often called *whoredom* in Scripture? Does not Whoredom dissolve the bonds of Marriage, by our Lords own determination? Did not the Lord give up the ancient *Israel* and *Judah*, and disavow them from being his Spouse, under the name of two notable Whores, *Aholah* and *Aholibah*: and if we rightly consider the *Revelations*, we find also this to be the very cause, why the Name of *Whore* is branded upon the forehead of a certain Congregation that was to appear in the World after the dissolution of *Rome Imperial*; and therefore God sent the *Saracens* and *Turks* against them, with stings both in Head and tayl, both in the East and West, but yet they *repented not* of their

2 Cor. 6. 16.

Ezek. 23. 4.

Rev. 9. 20, 21.

Idols,

Idols, &c. This is that Generation which layes ſtumbling-blocks, both before *Turks*, *Jews* and Heathens. For haſte, I le inſtance but in a few. Among the Four great Offences and Scandals, which the Grand Seignior told the *German* Ambaſſadour he took at the *Roman* Religion, one was, that they made their God in the Church; another, that they eat him in the Euchariſt. What would he have ſaid, had he heard of the Emperour *Henry* the 7th, his being poyſoned out of the Sacrament Cup, by a *Guelph* of the Popes Faction, or as Dr. *Donne* expreſſes it more earneſtly, To poyſon their God, that they might poyſon their Emperour? But how greatly the *Turks* are incenſed againſt Idols, the *Alcoran* almoſt every where diſcovers, and *Hottinger*, *Sands*, and others. As for the *Jews*, how greatly they are ſcandalized, we may obſerve even in Elder times, when the Second Council of *Nice* was fain to give a ſolemn though a ſorry anſwer to them, [ὄντως φοβερὸς ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐντελλάμενος τῷ Ισραὴλ, &c.] Verily, it was a terrible word, giving command to *Iſrael*, Not to make any carved Image, &c. and yet afterward to command *Moſes* to make Cherubims, yet not as Gods, but for Rememoration onely, &c. Not to obſerve at preſent how they ſhift off the Second Commandement, as if belonging to *Iſrael* onely; nor what they further reply about the framing of Images, not to be ultimate Objects of Worſhip, but onely commemorative helps of Devotion: That which I would principally take notice of, is, that even then at the firſt ſolemn and Judicial publication of Image-doctrine, how greatly the *Jews* were provoked and offended; who were ſo exact in the abhorrency of Images, that they counted it unlawfull to look up to an Image in Civil uſe; and forbad the very Art of Painters and Statuaries: Nay, ſo nice and curious, that they ſcruple to pluck out a Thorn out of their feet, or gather up Money caſually fallen, leſt they ſhould ſeem to ſtoop down in reſpect to any Image in ſuch a place; and as to the preſent indelible continuance of the ſame hatred, Sir *Edw. Sands* hath given a large account; and how they call Popiſh Churches, becauſe of the worſhip of Images in them, בית הרפה, *The Houſes of Idolatry*, or *filthineſſes*, with ſome remarkable Obſervations out of their Authors, may be ſeen in the Learned *Hornbeck*, his Treatiſe againſt the *Jews*.

Count *Serini's* Character, p. 107. *Paralip. Urſperg.* p. 267. *Naucler.* p. 991. *Donnes Pſeudomartyr*, p. 91. *Alcoran.* c. 10, 11, 13, 16, &c. *Hottinger*, the ſame, p. 60. *Sands*, p. 54. *Synod. Septim. Act.* 4. p. 556. *Tom.* 3. *Binii.* & *Dailly de Imag.* p. 68. *Hottinger. jur. Hebr.* p. 336. *Id.* p. 41. View of *Religion in the* Weſt. *Hornbeck cont. Judæos*, *proleg.* p. 17. and the learned *L. Sarſon* in his Roman *Cultus Nullitas*, p. 15. *Gage*, Survey of the *Weſt-Indies*, p. 175.

As to the Pagans or Heathens, I might enlarge, but I ſhall onely referre to a ſtory of the *Americans*, who being vex'd at the burning their wooden God, by Mr. *Gage*; replyed, That they knew it was a piece of wood, and *of it ſelf* could not ſpeak, but ſeeing it had ſpoken (as they were all witneſſes) this was a Miracle whereby they ought to be guided, and they did verily believe that God was in that piece of wood, which (ſince the ſpeech made by it) was more than ordinary wood, having God himſelf in it, and therefore deſerved more Offerings and Adorations than thoſe Saints (*i. e.* of the *Spaniards*) in the Church; who did never ſpeak unto people. And to this may be annex'd, ſince it touches upon Saint-Worſhip,) what *Sancta Clara* inſinuates, as a Reaſon why there's

no

no Precept under the Gospel for Invocation of Saints, *&c.* Least the converted Gentiles should believe, that they were again reduced to the Worship of Men, (*terrigenarum*) and according to their old custome, should adore Saints not as Patrons but as Gods. To conclude this point, since God hath so severely forbidden the Worshipping of his Divine Majesty by Statues, Pictures, Sculptures or Images, and in all Ages given ample Evidences of his wrath against such Worshippers: Since the true Christian Religion by means of such titular and nominal pretenders to it, is greatly vilified and obstructed in its progress, as to the sincere Conversion both of *Turks*, *Jews* and Heathens; we may easily discern where that dangerous Society resides, that commit Fornication with Stocks and Stones, termed by the Church of *England*, in her excellent and zealous Homilies against Idolatry, "A foul, filthy, old withered Harlot, *&c.* that "understanding her lack of natural and true beauty, and great loathsom-"ness (which of her self she hath) doth after the custom of such Harlots, "paint her self, and deck and tire her self with Gold, Pearl, Stone, and "all kind of precious Jewels.

Santta Clara Deus natura Gratia. p. 323. de invoc. Sanct.

Homily of the Church of *Engl.* in 3d. part of the Sermon against the *Peril of Idolatry*, f. 75. b.

(3.) Is that the true Church of Christ, that out of her own Invention, intermixt with *Jewish* and Heathenish Customs (as might be specified out of *Blondus*, *Polydore Virgil*, and others) hath patch'd up a pompous Worship, and bottom'd *now* upon that grand Fundamental of the *Popes Authority*; which (as 'tis said of *Jeroboams*,) is *devised of their own hearts*, and in comparison to the Institutions of Christ, and Scriptural, Apostolical, Primitive practice, is as it were but a Novelty, and of Yesterday. As to which, the History of the Church in most things gives us a precise account of their particular Rise and Genealogy; in the rest, we may evidently prove by the primitive Administrations, that *then they were not*, and afterward find, *when they were* in use and practice; though the exact moment of their intrusion be not determinable: Since they did, *sensim sine sensu*, secretly creep in, by the subtle artifice of some, and the sequacious temper of others; and likewise, that the barbarous times of the *Goths* and *Vandals*, making fearfull havock of Learning, and the rare Monuments of Antiquity, hath destroyed many Records. But however, there are great heaps of Rubbish and Soil, that might easily be sented up to their original Stable: Let's but instance in a few. The use of fine Linnen, Prayers in odd Numbers, Sanctuaries, Wax-candles, Worship towards the East, Ember-dayes, Consecrations, and the *Bacchanalia*, and other Feasts turned into the present Festivities; their Origine, and multitudes of others, may be observed out of *Polydor*, *Innocent* 3. *Durandus* his *Rationale*, and *Durantus de Ritibus*, *Rupertus Tuitiensis*, *Gavantus*, *Gratian*, *Ivo*, *Blondus*, and many others. Give me leave a little to enlarge upon one Constitution of the greatest moment, because 'tis a Fundamental amongst them, *&c.* The Decree of the *Lateran* Council under *Leo* the 10th, whereby the Popes Authority was fully settled, and whence he became exalted above a Council, and

1 King. 12. 33.

Polyd. Virgil. Bas. 1532. *Innocen.* 3. de Altari, Lipſ. 1534. &c.

Infallible, and to be adored; as 'tis in the *Ceremoniale Romanum*, l. 1. *p.* 51. & *l.* 3. *p.* 286. and 'tis this: *Solum Romanum Pontificem pro tempore existentem, tanquam Auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habentem*, &c. *manifestè constat*. It clearly appears, *&c.* that the *Roman* Bishop solely, for the time being, as having Authority over all Councils. And then, *p.* 121. *Cum de necessitate salutis existat omnes Christi fideles, Romano Pontifici subesse*: It is *necessary to Salvation*, that all Christs faithfull ones should be subject to the *Roman* Bishop. This was determined the 14 *Kal. Jan.* 1516. within the compass of the same year wherein *Luther* began to assault them, as may be observed out of *Sculletus* his Annals. Whence we may note, what a profound Question that is, when they demand of us, Where our Religion was before *Luther?* when as themselves do date the Commencement of the greatest point and Pillar of their Religion, *viz.* The Doctrine of *Infallibility*, within the same year wherein *Luther* arose; putting the Hay and Stubble of their infallible Judge, into the Foundation of the Church. Whereas, one of their own could boldly and freely assert, "That though the Catholicks "accuse them of pinning their Faith upon *Luther* and *Calvin*, which is "false: for neither *Luther* nor *Calvin* instituted any new Religion. When they ask, Where was ours? we answer, Where theirs is not; *sc.* Instituted by our blessed Lord, preached by the holy Apostles, set forth in the sacred Scriptures, and practised by the Primitive Churches, and preserved all along by some notable Confessors of the Truth in every Age, to our present times. But theirs indeed, as it now stands, built upon the *Lateran* and *Trent*-Councils, in their main Fundamental, is but a meer Novelty, started up in the very dayes of *Luther*; and in other things wherein they dissent from us, is but of later invention, in comparison with the Primitive Apostolical times. And in how many grand and weighty particulars (besides their accessory and gaudy Ceremonies) they dissent from Scriptures, forsake the Apostles, run contrary to the Sanctions of ancient Councils, might be at large educed out of Authentick Records, and demonstrated to be but a Novelty.

Binii Concil. Tom. 4. part. 1. Concil. Lateran. Sess. 11. Dat. Rom. 1516. 14 Kal. Jan.

Sculter. Annal. Ann. 1516.

Hist. Cardinals, *p.* 9.

Obj. But are there not several things found in the Reformed Churches that are of the same standing, and savour of equal Novelty, of which it may be said, *Non sic ab initio*, It was not so from the Beginning.

A. To which it may be replyed, That 'tis the duty of all Reformations, to come up exactly to Scripture, and what is not done at one time, *in levioribus aliquot*, in some smaller matters, may be performed at another. The ingenious *Bernard* glossing upon that of the *Canticles*, [*O thou fairest among Women,*] speaks thus; *Pulchram, non omnimodè quidem, sed pulchram inter mulieres eam docet*, viz. *cum distinctione, quatenus ex hoc amplius reprimatur, & sciat quid desit sibi:* He calls her Fair, yet not altogether, but fairest among women, *sc.* with a distinction; that hence she may be somewhat the more checkt, and know wherein she is defective. There's no Church under Heaven perfectly beautifull,

Preface to the Common-prayer.

Bernard in Cantic. Serm 38. f. 144. a.

beautifull, *that* remains for Glory, when Christ will present her to himself *without spot or wrinkle*. If but pretended Watchmen take away her spotted Vail, she'l be glad of a purer. *Fas est & ab hoste doceri*: It's wisdom to learn by the reproof of an Adversary. But as to the grand Fundamental points, we unanimously agree; we lay no other Foundation than the Rock Christ Jesus, and seriously profess the Scriptures to be our perfect Rule; and if any will teach us wherein we swerve, we are ready to yield Obedience to the Laws of Christ. So that (as the learned *Crakanthorp* determines) those persons, as *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Cyprian*, &c. though in some things they might erre, yet because they thought those things to be taught in Scripture, which they made their Guide, and were ready to reform upon Eviction out of the Holy Scriptures, they no doubt dyed in the Faith: But he teaches the contrary of those that hold the Popes infallible Judgement in Causes of Faith, for that's none of God's Foundation, whereupon to ground our Belief or practice.

Eph. 5. 26. Cant. 5. 7. *Crakanth.* of Councils, p. 192.

(4.) Can that be deemed a true Church of Christ successively in all Ages, that *varies from it self*, contradicts it self, makes Decrees quite contrary to precedent times, and that in matters of Faith? And if the Philosopher said right, that there is no *medium* in a perfect Contradiction; if the one be true, the other is equally as false; what shall be deemed of such a Society, that in the great matters of Faith have determined quite contrary, besides many other things of grand importance? Truth is alwayes Homogeneal, consistent and invariable. But here's Pope against Pope, Council against Council, one Society, Order and Fraternity against another: where shall a poor Christian (*sistere pedem*) fix his Resolution? If the former be true, the latter are undenyably false; if the latter be true, in what a case were the Fore-fathers of Old? in what state did they leave the world? how might this amaze the drowsie and inchanted world, did it but awaken to muse seriously on this point onely? Have not Popes from the Chair determined against each other, and that in matters of Faith, and other weighty cases? How *Sylverius* and *Vigilius* clash'd and conflicted, in that grand point of the three Chapters agitated in the fifth general Council, is at large set forth by the Learned *Crakanthorp*. Did not Pope *Agatho* determine quite contrary to Pope *Vigilius* in the same case, as may be observed in comparing the Actions of the fifth and sixth Council. *Stephen* the 6th, abrogates the Decrees of *Formosus*, digs up his Body, and cuts off the two fingers of his Right hand, which are used in Consecrations: And he addes, *Posteà ferè semper servata hæc consuetudo sit, ut Acta priorum Pontificum sequentes aut infringerent aut omninò tollerent*; That afterward this custom was almost alwayes kept up, That following Bishops did either invalidate or utterly take away the Acts of their Predecessors: Of which he gives Instances in *Romanus*, *Theodotus*, *John* 10. and *Sergius*. *Greg.* 1. determines him to be Antichristian, and to blaspheme, that should arrogate that profane

Arl. poster. t. 13.

Crak. Councils, p. 477. & alibi. Id. p. 28. *Platin.* in vit. f. 139. b.

Greg. Regist. l. 4. Ep. 32. 36. l. 6. Ep. 31. &c. Rom. Edit.

Name of *Supreme* over all other; and calls him *the King over all the children of Pride.* But his Name-sake *Greg.* 4. deposes every one, [*Sit ruinæ suæ dolore prostratus*, &c.] whosoever does not obey the Apostolical Seat; and *Nicolas* 2. pronounces him without doubt for a Heretick; and that worthy person *Greg.* 7. or *Hildebrand*, (as set out by † *Benno* the Cardinal, and others,) stigmatizes such with the Brands of Idolatry, Witchcraft and Paganisme, *Quisquis dum Christianum se asserit, sedi Apostolicæ obedire contemnit*; Whosoever asserting himself for a Christian, contemns to obey the Apostolical Chair. Again, *Cœlestine* 3. determines against a Divorce between Christians and Infidels, but *Innocent* 3. determines the contrary. Again, *Pelag.* 2. had commanded, that the Sub-deacons of *Sicily* should abstain from their Wives, but *Greg.* 1. sayes 'tis *durum & incompetens*, hard and inconvenient, and allowes the quite contrary; and the Glos's addes, That the Statute of *Pelagius* was against the Gospel. There are multitudes of Cases might be added, wherein they made no scruple to rescind, abrogate, and decree contrary to their Predecessors. But I shall (for haste sake) speak a little of the variance of *Councils* also.

Dist. 19. *c.* 5. col. 107. *Dist.* 22. *c.* 1. col. 130. † *Fascic. rerum expet. Dist.* 81. *c.* 15. col. 516, &c. *& Ivo. Decret.* 5 part. *de primat.* f. 153. *Decretal. l.* 3. *Tit.* 33. *c.* 1. col. 1276. *Ib. l.* 4. *c.* 6. col. 1556. *Caus.* 27. *q.* 2. *c.* 20. col. 1991. & *Dist.* 31. *c.* 1. col. 195.

The Council of *Constance* determines thus: *Est de necessitate salutis, credere Generale Concilium habere supremam Autoritatem in Ecclesiâ*: It is of *Necessity to Salvation*, to believe that a General Council hath *supreme* Authority in the Church; yea over the Pope himself: And this is ratified by Pope *Martin* the 5th, as the Fathers of *Basil* set it forth to all the world; and yet you have seen before, how that the *Lateran* Council hath determined the quite contrarry, stating it in those very words. That it is *necessary to Salvation*, that all Christs Faithfull ones should be subject to the *Roman* Bishop, and in that very point, as having Authority over all Councils.

Concil. Basil. in Epistola Synodali ad universos Christi fideles.

The Council of *Orange*, in many Canons, and that of *Milevis*, or *Melci* in *Numidia*, neer *Algier*, and the *African* Council (commonly so called) determine against *Free-will.* The Council of *Gangra* (now *Congria*) by the River *Halys*, determines *Anathema* to such as refuse to communicate with a married Priest. But these things are contradicted by *Trent.* The like might be shewn about *Romes* Jurisdiction, and communicating the *Cup* to the People, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other Points, which would swell too large: Neither will time admit the several varieties and Confessions to be recited out of *Augustin* of *Tarracena*, found in *Gratian*; nor the private Oppositions of their Doctors, in numerous cases, collected by a Reverend person. I shall conclude this Section with an Observation about the Holy Bible it self; whose former Editions not satisfying *Sixtus* 5. set forth a new one, ratified by his Edict, *An.* 1589. Then comes *Clement* 8. *A.* 1592. with another *Breve*, commanding another new Edition to be received with equal Veneration, and the contemners of it exposed to new Imprecations and Curses; and yet these two Editions of the holy Bible, differ in

Concil. Tom. 2. *p.* 340. a. *P.* 285. b. *P.* 305. a. *Gangr. concil. Can.* 4, &c. Paris 1618. *p.* 313. *cum Zenarâ.*

Bp. *Hall's Peace of Rome.*

two

two thousand places, and some so material, that they arise to flat contradictions, which is made evident by Dr. *James*, in his *Bellum Papale*, and the Edicts themselves, (because the *Sixtine* Bibles are hard to come by) are at large set forth by the learned *Amama*. So that if their Popes decretory Sentences in matters of Faith, their Councils in points necessary to Salvation, their Doctors in great and important concerns of the Church, their very Bibles (such as they will permit) in multitudes of places egregiously differ one from another; where shall a Christian fix his mind, in such a Society, under such grand uncertainties, contradictions and Oppositions one to another, in the high and momentous Concernments of Eternity and the other World. *Amama Antibarb. bell.* 4to. p. 67. 98, &c.

(5.) Can such claim the Honour of being a true Church of Christ, which impiously derogate from the Essential Honour of God and of Jesus Christ? that exalt a sinfull man unto the Dignities and incommunicable Excellencies of the Divine Majesty? I trow not: But such there are, who highly pretend to Christ and his holy Church, and yet dare to open their mouths in strange and fearfull Expressions, in their *Canon-Law*; when they magnifie their *Roman* President: [He is said to have a heavenly Arbitrement, he changes the Natures of things, *&c.* he can make any thing of nothing. In what *he* wills, his Will stands for Reason; neither may any say, *Why dost thou so?* which is by *Job* applyed to God. He can make Justice out of Injustice, by correcting and changing of Laws, and hath the fulness of Power.] They alledge, *that the Pope was called God* by *Constantine*; and again, Not *Man* but *God* separates them, whom the *Roman* Bishop does, who bears the Viceroyship of the true God in the Earth, (but that never was nor can be proved). *Again*, To *believe* that the *Lord our God* the Pope, the Enactor of this Decree, could not so determine, is heretical. *Again*, It's Idolatry, Paganisme and Heresie, not to obey the *Roman* Seat: not one *Iota* of his Statutes must be disputed. *Again*, Christ professes himself to preside under the Faith and Name of *Peter*, &c. and although he lead innumerable People by Troops to Hell, (or *primo Mancipio Gehennæ, i.e. Diabolo*, sayes the Glos,) there to be eternally beaten with many stripes, yet none must reprove him, *&c.* And to name no more, The common Extravagants, treating of Christs Power and his Vicars, the Glos upon Pope *Boniface*, set out by *Greg.* 13. addes this, *Non videretur Dominus discretus fuisse, ut cum ejus reverentiâ loquar, nisi unicum post se talem Vicarium reliquisset qui hæc omnia posset:* "The Lord would not "seem to have been discreet, that I may speak with reverence of him, un"less he had left such an onely Vicar behind him, who might do all these "things. Whoso desires to know more of the like tremendous matter, may peruse *Ranchinus* his Review of the Council of *Trent*, an Author of their own, and many others. *Decretal. Greg.* 9. *l.* 1. *Tit.* 7. *c.* 3. *glos.* Job 9. 12. *Dist.* 96. *c.* 7. *Decretal. l.* 1. *Tit.* 7. *c.* 3. *glos.* *Extrav. Joan.* 22. *Tit.* 14. *c.* 4. col. 153. *Dist.* 81. *c.* 15. col. 517. & *dist.* 19. *c.* 5. *glos.* col. 107. *Extrav. Joan.* 22. *Tit.* 14. *c.* 4. *glos.* col. 145. *Caus.* 24. *q.* 1. *c.* 10. *glos.* col. 1835. *Extrav. Com. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *de Maj.* fol. 211. *Review of the Council of* Trent, *p.* 114.

(6.) The sixth and last Inquiry is, Whether that can be a true Church, that persecutes them to the utmost, yea and upon that very account,

count, because they teach, profess and maintain the holy Doctrine and pure VVorship, which was left by our blessed Lord and his Apostles, in the holy Scriptures? And this is not an accidental thing, falling out now and then when cruel ones sit in power, for 'tis by Principle: To go no higher than *Trent*, what great points of Primitive Christianity are smitten with terrible *Anathema's*? Nay, what smaller differences are made obnoxious to the same indignation? as to say Marriage is no Sacrament, and that it does not conferr Grace; or to say the Church cannot dispense with the degrees of Consanguinity, or Affinity in *Leviticus*; or to say that Matrimonial Causes belong not to Ecclesiastical Judges, &c. or if we enquire all the Causes that state men guilty of Heresie; what guilt would millions be involved in at that Tribunal? To deny the Supremacy of *Rome*, is absolute Heresie; and *Pius* the second has determined it to be Treason and Heresie to appeal to a future Council. In what a case stands the *Gallican* Church? Now in these and all other points they will be Judges in their own Cause; though sometimes they have asserted, That what touches all, ought to be approved by all, and *Nicholas* 1. and *Celestine* 3. profess'd, that even Reason it self teaches, that our Enemies must not be our Judges; and the Canon-Law expressely, That the Pope himself must not judge in his own Cause: Yet they proceeded at *Trent*, though the Clergy of several Provinces were absent, and some Christian Princes disavowed it. Now what becomes of persons thus determined against and excommunicated? why the Canon-Law dispatches the matter speedily: *Non arbitramur*, &c. We do not esteem them for Murderers, who burning with zeal of the Catholick Mother-Church, should happen to kill any that are excommunicated; and besides, Hereticks are reckoned in so black a Catalogue, that Faith is not to be kept with them; and although *Molanus* and others seem to differ, that's but a private Opinion, they but plow upon the Ocean, and write upon the Sea-sands, so long as it stands in force in the Canon-Law. *Absolutos se noverint*, &c. Let them know that they are absolved from the Obligation of Fealty, Homage and all Duty, whoever were held bound by any Covenant, strengthened by whatsoever band, to such as are manifestly lapsed into Heresie: and the Council of *Constance* hath defined, That the safe conduct of Princes granted to such, ought to be no barre to Ecclesiastical Procedures; *Quocunque vinculo se astrinxerint*; By whatever Band they have obliged themselves. And then let's observe a ruled Case laid down in the same Canon-Law: *Frustrà sibi fidem quis postulat*, &c. In vain does any man require Faith to be kept to himself by him, to whom he refuseth to keep the Faith plighted by himself. Now what brave work would these things make in the world, since all the Reformed Churches lie prostrate under the Thunderbolts of the *Roman* Capitol? First censured for Hereticks, and then no punishment is severe enough: What will become of Christian or of Humane Society, if any Church differ from their Sentiments? And what sad Havock has been made in the Earth, the

Concil. Trident. Sess. 24. Can 1, 2, 12.

Dist. 22. c. 1. omnes.

Pii 2. Commentar. p. 92. Franc. 1614.

Reg. Juris, 29.

Cauf. 16. q. 6. c. 1. gloss.

Cauf. 23. q. 5. col. 1791.

Decretal. l. 5. Tit. 7. c. 16. col. 1686.

Concil. Constant. Sess. 19. f. 523. b.

Reg. Jur. 75. col. 850.

Bulla Cœnæ per Sixt. 5.

the red lines in the Annals and Martyrologies of most Churches, doe abundantly testifie; even for such things as are consonant to the holy Scriptures. How unmanly and brutish, to use Blowes instead of Reasons! yea, how deviliſh, to persecute men for keeping the Commandments of God! They are of the seed of the *red Dragon*, *Rev.* 12. 17. How vain, to think to conquer mens spirits by Croziers turn'd into Swords, and Keyes into Guns! Persecution indeed may turn some, but 'tis into Hypocrites; that man's never gain'd, but exasperated. That's a declining Cause that can't support it self by the same means by which it was at first propagated. Did the Apostles so, whose lines ran to the ends of the Earth, and conquered so great a part of the *Roman* World to Christ by the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God? Good *Bernard* said once to *Eugenius*, what do you use a Sword for, you are commanded to sheath it, (as *Peter*) do the work of an Evangelist, and feed the Sheep? Our Lord did not bid *Peter* feed his Sheep with Iron and Steel, or his Lambs with twisted Wire; though *Baronius* said, *Peter's* Ministery hath two parts, *To feed, and to kill. Hist. of the Quarrels of Venice*, p. 65. That Pastor shews weakness in Policy, that takes wayes to increase dissenters; as *Polydore* could observe, that the Churches troubles under *Pagan* Emperours, so increased the numbers of Believers, that they were at length more suspected for their Multitudes, than their Religion. The more *Israel* was afflicted in *Egypt*, the more they multiplyed and grew, *Exod.* 1. 12. *Rome* never lost ground so fast, as since they used the silly Engine of Persecution to gain it. Mankind is not devoid of Humanity, and Christianity has Nobler Maxims than *Phalaris*; such as flow from that Prince of Might, Elect, who bids the world learn of him, *for he is meek and lowly*; who rebuked the Apostles for desiring that fire might descend upon the *Samaritans*, Luk. 9. 54. and so is his blessed Church a flight of Doves, and a flock of Sheep, who by the generous power of the Spirit of God in Conversion, doe *Ponere id bruti*, lay down the brutish Tyger at the foot of the Prince of Peace, and, of ferocious and savage by Nature, become mild, meek and peaceable, forgiving and forbearing one another, because God for Christs sake hath forgiven them.

Eph. 6.

Bern. de Consid. ad Eugen. l. 1416.

Polydor. Virg. l. 4. c. 11.

Psal. 45. 3.

Eph. 4. 32. Col. 3. 12, 13.

But how unhappy are they that leave the Posts of Wisdom, and take Sanctuary at the Gates of Hell, and adde this Note, (besides Purity of Doctrine, VVorship and Discipline) whereby the Church may be known, *Viz.* Its perilous and troublesome state, and shew to be of the world: As our Lord foretold, *In the World ye shall have tribulation, but in me ye shall have peace.* VVhere Hawks and VVolves do haunt, there's Dove-coats or Flocks of Sheep neer. So that if any ask, Where our Church was of old? Reply, VVhere Persecutions tryed their Faith. They know well enough where it was, they need not ask us: 'Tis but reading their own Records, their *Rubrica*, their Scarlet Registers, and they'l easily discern, by the Scriptural points for which holy men suffered, a sufficient mark and evidence of the true Church.

Joh. 16.

Let's

Let's then briefly recapitulate and conclude, That since there are to be found such as in fundamental Doctrines determine contrary to Christ and the blessed Apostles, such as by Idolatry have broken Covenant with God, and give even the VVorship of *Latria* to Creatures, due to him alone; can such without Repentance and Reformation enter into the Kingdom of Heaven? such as form à VVorship to God out of their own Inventions and Novelties, such as contradict themselves in very material and important matters of Salvation; such as blasphemously derogate from the Glory and Honour of Jesus Christ; such as persecute them who profess and endeavour to follow onely the Apostolical Rules, and the consonant practice of the primitive Churches? Though they may pretend to a Unity and Uniformity, yet does it not result into a League and Conspiracy against the Truth? The Ship of the Church is in danger to split against such a Rock as this. Can we judge such Societies and Communions to be true Churches of Christ; and not rather consent with the Determination of the Church of *England*, to the contrary? 2d *part*, *Homil.* for *Whit-Sunday*.

1 Cor. 6. 9. Rev. 14. 10, 11. 21. 8. 22. 15.

If *Charles* the Great, *Alcuinus*, *Agobardus*, *Bertram*, *Bernard*, Abbot *Joachim*, *Peter de Vineis*, *Marsilius*, *Dantes*, *Bradwardin*, *Petrarch*, *Mantuan*, *Gerson*, *Clemangis*, *Theodoricus de Nyem.* and the compiler of *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, and many others down along the darker times, might bring in their suffrages in various points; It might be justly feared, that the late Abbot *Gualdi* would be acquitted from rashness in concluding that, "Amongst all the Churches since the Beginning of the "World, there has not been found that unconstancy and confusion as in "the Church of *Rome*, so many Antipopes, Schismes, Heresies, Controversies, Confusions, Suspensions, Persecutions, so many false Opinions, "Scandals, Tyrannies, and intestine Quarrels, as there. But we will rather turn these complaints into unfaigned prayer for their Salvation, and wish them no more hurt than to our own Souls, that the great God would give them Repentance to the acknowledging of the Truth.

Hist. of Cardinals, p. 39.

2 Tim. 2. 25.

3 *Corollary.* III. Since those are true marks of the Church of God, which the Church of *England* hath exhibited, and have been in some measure insisted upon; we may conclude, that *the people of God* in *Britain* (blessed be his holy Name) are in the happy possession of the true Apostolical Doctrine and Worship, according to the holy Scriptures, and consonant to what the true Church of God hath held in all Ages, since the Lord Jesus, the Apostle and High-priest of our Profession, hath left this Heavenly Commission of the Father with his Church.

Heb. 3. 1.

It were no difficult task (onely of labour) to shew out of our own Monuments and Antiquities, and from the VVritings and Records of several Ancients and Moderns, that *Britain* was not converted by such as came from *Rome*, but by others that came hither in the Reign of *Tiberius*, and such as attended *Joseph* of *Arimathea* sent out of *Gaul* by *Philip*. 1. That *Philip* preach'd the Gospel in *Gaul*, *Isidorus*, and our ancient

Isidorus de Sanctis l. 1. Orthodox. pat. Vol. 1. f. 598.

ancient *Nennius*, and *Freculfus*, do atteſt. That *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* came into *Britain* to preach the Goſpel, is exceeding probable; unleſs to ſuch whom no ancient Teſtimonies, Records or Traditions doe ſavour or reliſh, but ſuch as gratifie their own private Fancies and Deſigns: Yea, ſeveral agree that he came at the inſtance and by the direction of *Philip*. If the Charters and Muniments ſet forth in *Monaſticon Anglicanum*; if the Charter of *Henry* the 2d, granted to the Abby of *Glaſtenbury*, which our Annaliſt *John Stow* ſayes he both ſaw and read, and Sir *John Price*, in his Defence of the *Hiſtory of Britain* recites (*verbatim*) in part; wherein our King declares the ſeveral Grants of his *Britiſh* and *Saxon* Anceſtors, which (ſayes he) *Diligenter feci inquiri, & coram me præſentari & legi*: I cauſed to be diligently ſearched out, to be preſented and read before me; where the very Deeds of K. *Arthur*, and *Kenwalch* a Pagan Prince, are mentioned; and in ſome of them that place is called the *Mother of Saints*, the *Grave of the Saints*, and that it was firſt built by the very diſciples of Chriſt themſelves: If theſe be not enough, let *Capgrave* ſpeak, mentioning the Acts of *Arthur* and *Melkin* of *Avalon*, or *Glaſtenbury*, who lived before *Merlin*, an Author not utterly to be contemned, eſpecially by ſome, as having reſcued ſeveral Memorials from the Grave of Oblivion: Let *Balens* teſtifie, delivering many things from *Leland*, one employed by King *Henry* 8. in ſearching the Antiquities of *Britain*, and out of *Fleming*, *Scroop*, and others; yea *Leland* himſelf, in his aſſertion of King *Arthur*: Not to mention ſuch as have been of later date, as *Polydor Virgil*, and *Harding*, *Pitſeus*, &c. According to theſe it appears, that what work *Joſeph* performed in *Britain*, was by the Recommendation of *Philip* out of *Gaul*, and not from *Italy*. But yet we may aſcend higher, and ſhew, that the ſeeds of Chriſtian Religion were firſt ſown in this Iſland 26 years earlier, *ſc.* in the latter end of the Reign of *Tiberius*: For thus writes our ancient *Gildas*, [both of *Polydors* Edition, and *Joſſelins*,] *Tempore, ut ſcimus, Summo Tiberii Cæſaris*, &c. *radios ſuos primum indulget*, i.e. *ſua præcepta Chriſtus*: "Chriſt firſt indulgeth his Rayes, *i. e.* his Pre-"cepts, in the latter end of *Tiberius Cæſar*, as we know.] This teſtimony of *Gildas Badonicus* is alſo confirmed by *Gildas Albanius*, in his Tract of the Victory of *Aurelius Ambroſe*, as ſome relate; but however, let's take the former *Gildas* his time, whereof, though ſome of ours have in ſome meaſure debated, yet let us a little further examine it. The laſt year of *Tiberius* fell in *An. Chr.* 37. as *Petavius* one of their exacteſt Chronologers ſtates it; who brings *Peter* firſt to *Rome A.* 42. and ſets him in the Chair *An.* 43. But the *Britains* receiv'd the Goſpel five years before his coming to *Rome*, and that while *Peter* was yet (in the Year 37.) at *Joppa*. But if *Baronius* his account be true, (who has but a ſmall Faculty at Chronology, or Aſtronomical Calculations, eſpecially of Eclipſes, ſo neceſſary to an Annaliſt, beſides the truth of his allegation;) he brings *Peter* to *Rome*, *An.* 44. but ſettles his Epiſcopal

Bal. de Script. fol. p. 15. *Freculf.* Tom. 2. l. 2. c. 4. p. 448.

Monaſt. Angl. Vol. 1. p. 13. &c.

Stow Annals p. 37.

Price in defence hiſt. Brit. p. 111.

Uſſer primord. p. 337. 740.

Spelman Concil. Tom. 1. appar. p. 12.

Stow, p. 37. & *Selden* polyolb. p. 54.

Capgrave de Joſeph Ar. f. 197. *a. b.*

Bal. p. 15. Baſ. 1559 fol.

Leland Aſſert. Arth. M. S. *Harding*, f. 40, 41. Anno 63.

Polydor p. 52. *Pitſeus* p. 12.

Gildas ex edit. Polydor. p. 10. 1525 & edit. Joan. Joſſelin, p. 9. b. 1568.

Fox Martyrol. Vol. 1. p. 137.

Dr. *Maſon*, p. 52. *Biſhop* of Cov. grand impoſt. p. 35.

Petav. de doct. temp. l. 11. c. 8. p. 304.

Act. 9. 10.

Baron. Annal. A. 44. n. 11, 25.

Id. ad Ann. 44. n. 28. & A. 45. n. 1.

Chair there, *An.* 45. If this be true, the *Britains* receiving the Gospel *An.* 37. must then anticipate *Peters* coming to *Rome*, seven years, and erecting his Seat, and ordering a Church there, eight years. Again, *Marianus Scotus* brings him to *Rome*, *An.* 47. and then *Britains* Conversion antedates theirs by ten years. But all this and much more that might be urged, lies upon the Supposition of *Peters* being there at all, which many of the Learned greatly question. For *Marsilius* of *Padua* argues, that *Peter* was not there, and that *Paul* was the first Bishop of *Rome*. But these things impeach not our Cause at all, forasmuch as all the Apostles had the same Commission with parity of Honour and Power.

Marian Scotus, p. 367.

Marsil. defer. pacis, p. 207.

Id. ib.

If then the *British* Church were planted before ever *Peter* came to *Rome*, let's call to mind that ancient Rule, *Omnes Ecclesiæ huic subjectæ manent à quo institutæ sunt:* All Churches remain subject to him, (*i. e.* in his Successors) by whom they were instituted. And this is not so much a private, as a publick Sanction of the general Council of *Ephesus*, in the case of the *Cypriots*; who having received the Faith from *Barnabas*, yet were much molested by the Bishops of *Antioch*: Concerning whom the *Ephesine* Fathers made a Decree, and extended it to all Churches: *Nullus Episcoporum*, &c. *aliam Provinciam quæ non antea & ab initio fuit sua, sub suam*, &c. *manum trahat:* "Let no Bishop "bring under his power another Province, which was not his before, and "from the beginning.] This is yet more insisted upon by *Zonaras*, in his Comment upon the 8th Canon of that Council, and by *Balsamon* in his *Scholea*; and what is there spoken of *Cyprus*, some have applyed also to *Creet* upon the same ground: but it's not time to discuss that, or of other Provinces. Suffice this Canon to our case; That since *Britain* received the first glorious Light of true Faith from other Disciples of our Lord, and not from *Peter*, and was converted some years before ever the common Tradition of *Peters* coming to *Rome* can be cleared: This Rule totally exempts us from all Jurisdiction pretended by them; since we are (upon these grounds) evidently reducible to some of the *Asian* or *Greek* Churches, in respect to the ancient Rites of Worship, concording with theirs, and oppugnant to *Rome*. This was the Quarrel between the *British* Bishops, and *Austin* the Monk, as Venerable *Bede* relates, *in multis*, in many things, but especially in the celebration of *Easter*, and Ministration of Baptism. This troubled the North *British* Churches; about which very thing the Synod at *Whitby* was called, *An.* 664. and there *Hilda* and her associates averred their customs from *John*, *Philip*, *Polycarp*, &c. of the Eastern Communion. Neither were these matters wholly silenced as to the *Welsh Britains*, till the year 762. More might be said also about *Lucius* and *Ethelberts* times, that the last especially was but an attempt to yoke the *British* Churches under the Dominion of *Rome*, which they stoutly resisted. And it might be evidenced, that Christian Religion was initiated among the *Saxons* before

Acta Concil. Ephesin. Tom. 3. App. cap. 4. p. 201. Edit. Peltan. Concil Ephesin Zonaræ, p. 85. Edit. Par. 1618.

Balsam. in Synod. Ephes. Can. 8. p. 319. Paris, 1620.

Concil. a S. Paulo p. 18.

Bed. l. 2. c. 2. p. 112.

Baleus, f. 81. Spelm. Concil. p.

Lloyds Brev. of Brittain. fol. 37. b.

Austin

Austin the Monk arrived. For Queen *Bertha* enjoyed the Benefit of Christian Worship, by the Ministry of *Luidhardus* a Bishop, sent with her out of *France*, and it was celebrated in a *British* Church dedicated to S. *Martin*, in the East-side of the City of *Canterbury*, and built in the time of the *Romans*, as some others were which *Austin* had leave to repair. Bed. l. 1. c. 26. Ib. c. 26.

But say, 1. We received our Light first from *Rome*, (which is false;) and grant, 2. The Dominion of *Peter* to be Universal; and yield, 3. The Bishop of *Rome* to be his undoubted Successor; and that, 4. There are no flawes in the Old Chair; and that, 5. This Bishop is invested by Christ with all the Priviledges of an Apostle; which are all precarious and begg'd: Yet, if they apostatize from the Doctrine and Faith of *Peter*, must all other Churches be censured for separating from them who separate from Christ, from *Peter* and from *Paul*? We profess to hold unfeignedly with Old *Rome*, whatever it held according to *Pauls* Epistle to the *Romans*, nay and with the Church in *Babylon*, (possibly neer *Memphis*,) in whatever they retained of *Peters* Doctrine: When they are return'd to *Peter* and *Paul's* Doctrine, *&c.* then let them treat with us; but else, if any depart, that old Maxim should be refresh'd, *Causa, non Separatio Schismaticum facit*: 'Tis not Separation, but the Cause that determines Schisme. They are *Schismaticks* that depart from *Peter*, *Constit. Apostol. l. 6. c. 4.* And another not to be forgotten; [*Dum Ecclesia habet Pastorem Hæreticum vel Schismaticum, vacare intelligitur*:] While a Church hath a Heretick or Scismatick for its Pastor, it's to be counted Vacant.] In which case what shall be said to their own *Genebrard*, who affirms, That Fifty Popes in Succession, for almost one hundred and fifty years together, were either *Apostatici, vel Apostatici, potius quam Apostolici*: Irregular or Apostates, rather than Apostolical. Pope *Marcellinus* said, He could not see how they could be saved, who were advanced to the Papacy, *Onuphr. in vit. Marcell.* I shall not here enlarge upon any of their irregular Intrusions into the Throne, the Fighting and Blood-shed (mentioned by *Ammianus*) at the Election of *Damasus*, nor their personal Vices and Heresies, nor the Insession of the Chair by that Learned Dame, unkindly mentioned by *Laonicus*, and uncomfortably revived in our Church-Homilies: When these points are duely and seriously weighed, what cause the Reformed have had for a Secession and departure from them, to the Glory of God, to the Reverence of *Peters* Doctrine, to the Comfort and Peace of our Consciences; let the *Greek* Churches, or any other that maintain Scripture-Doctrine and Worship, nay, let all in other parts of the World that own the true God, be Judges.

1 Pet. 5. 13. ἐν Βαβυλῶνι. Decreta Greg. 9. l. 5. Tit. 7. f. 285. Par. *Genebrard* Chron. La. Ann. 904. f. 87. *Amian.* l. 27. *Laonicus* Chalcocondyl. de reb. Turc. l. 6. p. 100. Ed. Col. Allobr. 1615. 2d. part of the Serm. for Whitsunday, f. 332. a.

But to draw to an end: How greatly ought we to resound his Praises, who hath in all Ages, through the depth of the darkest times, conserved the true Faith and Doctrine all along, and of his great Mercy conveyed to us authentick Testimonies and Evidences, notwithstanding the Barbarism

barism and Violence of several Ages against the Truth. Nay, it might be shewn, that God hath not left us without a Lamp of Testimony to the most material Points, even here in *Britain*; but that it would arise to a little Chronicle, not proper for this Place and Time, but obvious to be observed, in the several Hints and Reflections upon what they called Errours, in several publick Synods in this Island, even till the time of *Wickliff*, when the Truth broke out more gloriously, and still shineth in great Lustre, blessed be his most holy Name.

4 Corollary. IV. Hath Almighty God, of his infinite goodness, so graciously hitherto preserved his Church, and bestowed upon the Reformed Countreys his most holy Bible, translated with great care and diligence out of the Sacred Originals into our Mother-tongues, and poured out that Grace to endeavour to Reform, according to his Heavenly Directions therein recorded; *let us give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip*, and *hold fast* that which we have received from Heaven, that *no man take away our Crown*. Let's take heed of Wantonness, of resisting or abusing the blessed Gospel, or any way walking unworthy of it, lest God provoked by our Unholiness, should remove the Golden Candlestick into Corners, or to other Nations. Let's take great heed of creeping corruptions, and of those Communions that erre in Faith, departing from the Head, from the Scriptures, from the Doctrine of the Apostles, from Purity of Worship, lest if we partake of their Sins, we be involved also in their Plagues. *Come out of her, my people*, sayes the Lord; and having been obedient to the Heavenly Vision, let us keep our Garments unspotted, that men see not our shame, as we love the Salvation of our Souls, and the Glory of the Son of the Living God, the onely true Basis and Rock of his Church. Let's heartily pity, and earnestly pray for such as are yet Judicially hardened to believe a Lye.

Heb. 2. 1.

Rev. 3. 11.

Rev. 18. 4.

Rev. 16. 15.

2 Thes. 2. 10, 11.

5 Corollary. V. Since our blessed Lord hath built his Church upon *himself*, who is a *Rock flowing with Milk and Honey*, then all true Believers being fixed upon this amiable and lovely Foundation *laid in Zion*, should sweetly unite in holy Love together, *being rooted and built up together in him*. Let not these living Marbles, polisht for *Solomon*'s Palace, dash against one another. Let not the Sheep of Christ push each other.

Col. 2. 7.

Quis teneros mihi fascinat agnos?

Who hath bewitched you, O foolish *Galatians*? These unnatural buttings (as Shepherds observe) presage very stormy dayes. Shall Roses that grow in *Sharon*, gash each others tender sides, and the Churches Vines turn Brambles? When some Troops in an Army fight not against the Enemy, but give fire at their own Regiments, is it not a notorious sign of Infatuation, or Conspiracy against their Native Prince? Shall a few Externals engage spirits in mutual heats and conflicts, to the laughter, scorn, and hope of the Adversary; who will joyn with one part for a while, that they may devour both at last, and blow up those intestine

heats

heats into a flame, at which they'l joyfully warm their hands? Mildneſs and Meekneſs is the Glory of a Chriſtian; and the way to gain Brethren to our Opinions, is by ponderous Arguments and ſweet Affections. Naturaliſts obſerve, that Fiſh will never be taken by a bloody Net; and when Sheep bring forth Lions, 'tis portentuous of Tyranny. It's utterly impoſſible in our lapſed Eſtate, to make all of a Mind, and a moſt improper Means, to propagate Opinions by Violence. *Socrates* treating of the Diverſities about *Eaſter*, and other Rites, in an excellent Chapter tending to Chriſtian Union, ſayes, ἐλπὶς οὖν ἐστὶ τοῖς ἑαυτὸς διώκουσιν. That they by no means diſſociated from one another, and that thoſe who conſent in the ſame Faith, may differ in Rites and Ceremonies, and that the Apoſtles gave no Precepts about ſuch matters, but left all to their free liberty; and again, bewails ſuch as in his time counted Whoredom indifferent, but ſtrove for ſuch Feaſts as for their Lives. Neither may we forget thoſe golden ſayings of bleſſed *Auſtin*: [*Interminabilis eſt iſta contentio generans lites, non finiens queſtiones: ſit ergo una fides*, &c. *etiamſi ipſa fidei unitas quibuſdam diverſis Obſervationibus celebratur, quibus nullo modo quod in fide verum eſt, impeditur*: "This Contention is "endleſs, gendring to ſtrife, not putting an end to Queſtions: let the Faith "therefore be one, *&c.* although the Unity of Faith be celebrated with "certain diverſe Rites, by which that which is true in the Faith, is no "wayes hindred.] All the Glory of the Queen is within; thoſe outward Rites are onely the Embroydery of her Garments, which may be of various Colours. The Dove of the Church may have her *Wings covered with Silver, and her Feathers with yellow Gold.* The ſame Army may have diverſity of Banners, and yet fight unanimouſly and victoriouſly under one and the ſame General. We agree in the main, *and whereto we have already attained, let's walk by the ſame Rule*, and *mind the ſame thing*, and if any be otherwiſe minded, God may in time reveal even that unto them. There will never be Peace in the Chriſtian World, ſo long as ſcrupulous Externals are by proud and fooliſh perſons preſs'd with equal rigour to many Subſtantials and Fundamentals.

Ælian.

Socrat. Eccl. hiſt. l. 5. c. 21. p. 696.

p. 697.

p. 699.

Auguſt. Ep. 86. p. 388.

Pſal. 45.

Pſal. 68. 13.

Phil. 3. 15, 16. Gal. 6. 16.

So far are ſome pious Spirits from this fiery temper, that they are not without hope of ſeveral in farre different Communions: But if any among ours ſpeak or write more mildly, favourably and ſoftly, of ſome of theirs, 'tis not to be underſtood of ſuch as finally perſiſt in the high and fundamental points of difference; but of them that privately whiſper and ſigh among their Friends, *Sic dicerem in Scholis, ſed tamen (maneat inter nos) diverſum ſentio*, &c. *non poteſt probari de ſacris literis*, &c. "So I ſpeak in the Schools, but yet (let that be kept private) I think "otherwiſe, and that it cannot be proved out of Holy Scriptures. Of ſuch as ſincerely cry out with the Cardinal, *Tutiſſimum eſt fiduciam totam in ſolâ Dei miſericordiâ & benignitate reponere. It's ſafeſt to caſt all our Confidence on the Mercy and Benignity of God onely:* To adhere to the precious Blood of Chriſt alone, without Works. There be

Urſperg. paraſ. p. 343. Edit. 1609.

Bell. de juſtif. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 7. p. 276. Col. Ag. 1628.

ſome

some even in *Babylon* of his People, to be called out in the Day of Vengeance, *Rev.* 18. 4. Such as are in heart ours, and as to the Cardinal Point of Justification, dye in the Reformed Religion; such as *Pighius* (though otherwise bitter,) as *Vergerius*, *Gerson*, *Ferus*, *Jansenius*, and Father *Paul* the *Venetian*, and many others.

Osiand. Cent. 16. p. 501.

6 Corallary. VI. In the sixt and last place. All the true living Members of the holy Church of Christ, may be greatly comforted from this Text and Doctrine; for though the Church will never be fully quiet and at rest, while the Gates of Hell stand undemolisht, but will be still exposed to furious Assaults, to boysterous waves, tempestuous storms, direfull persecutions, and secret undermining Heresies, to their *Molimina* and *Blandimenta*: Sometimes to fierce Oppositions and flattering Inticements, and sometimes to both together, yet herein stands the Faith and Patience of the Saints. Therefore all gracious Christians must be content, and resolved to exercise themselves in this spiritual Warfare, and by fervent Prayer call down Auxiliary help from Heaven, whereby the invincible and omnipotent God is humbly implored, and Legions of holy Angels sent in for assistance. Yet,

R.v. 13. 10. 14. 12.

(1) Let holy Souls be comforted in this, that *no Weapon formed against Mount Zion shall* finally *prosper. The Virgin Daughter of Zion hath despised them, and laughed them to scorn, the Daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at them.* For as the Golden-mouth'd Preacher expresses it, Τὴν Βελοθήκλω αὐτῦ ἐξεκένωσεν ὁ διάβολος, τὴν δὲ ἐκκλησίαν ἐκ ἔβλαψε. *Satan hath emptied his quiver, but hath not hurt the Church.* By how much the more the Enemies rage against her, by so much the more the true Professors of Piety and Faith increase: Not unlike the Vine, that growes the more fertile by pruning, or as the Palm, that rises the more erect after weights and pressures; and although in time of trouble, like some Plants that shut up their Flowers upon a storm, yet afterward display their lively and lovely colours more Oriently to the face of the shining Sun. The Church of God, though she be not alwayes so openly visible, as that all the World shall cry *Hosanna* to her splendor and glory, yet she growes more numerous, holy and stable, by her troubles: Her Enemies may seem for a time ἰσχύειν, *valere*, but shall not κατισχύειν, *prævalere*, as 'tis promis'd in the Text; to be *potent* and strong, but shall never subdue and vanquish her. They might believe Christ, and spare their trouble. They may *vires exerere*, put forth their utmost power, but the Gates of Hell, (ἅδης, *portæ Mortis*,) of Death and the Grave, shall never attain to, or compass so deadly a stroke, as shall extirpate the Church in any Age. Nay, the Wisdom of God hath ever turned their Policies into Folly, and their Puissance into Cowardice. They have often been forced to suck up the Cockatrice-Egges that they have laid, and felt the keenness of their own recoiling Arrowes. They may open, but shall never be able to swallow the Church: They may cast out floods, but shall never drown her; as he said of ancient *Rome*, *Mersa profundo, pulchrior*

Isa. 54. 17. 37. 22.

Chrysost. Serm. 1. in Penticost. Tom. 5 p. 979. Ed. Æton.

Rev 12. 15, 16.

pulchrior evenit: Cast her in the Sea, she dives, and rises again with her face washt from spots, and looks more beautifull. The Church may be press'd for a while, but suppress'd never. The Archers may *shoot sorely at her, but her bow shall abide in strength.* God will have a Church to endure to the Worlds end, in spight of all the privy Leagues and Confederacies that are contrived in, or all the Forces and Powers that issue from the Gates of Hell. *Her place of defence shall be the Munition of Rocks*; and *all the Nations that fight against Ariel shall be as the dream of a Night Vision.* Isa. 33. 16. Isa. 29. 7.

(2) The Church after all Assaults and Conflicts, in fine, shall be compleatly victorious and triumphant; she will joyfully survive her Enemies, and behold their Funerals. Let holy Souls rely upon this promise in the Text, and improve it in Prayer for their comfort and sustentation; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. *The Nations shall see it and be confounded at all their might, &c. They shall lick the dust like a serpent, and move out of their holes like worms of the earth: they shall be afraid of the Lord our God, and fear because of him.* There is a time, and it hastens, that this Rock shall dash them in pieces, and *they shall become like the chaffe of the Summer-threshing-floores, and the wind shall carry them away*, and no place be found for them. There is a glorious time a coming, (*rumpantur ut ilia Romæ,*) when the Stones of this Temple shall be *laid with fair colours, and her Foundations with Saphirs, her Windowes with Agates, her Gates with Carbuncles, and all her Borders with pleasant Stones*; when the false Rock of the pretended *Peter* shall like a Milstone be flung into the depth of the Sea, and her gaudy Ædifice shall melt into foam, and be dissipated among the Waters. Then shall one of their own Prophecies (I mean of the *Irish Malachy,*) be surely fulfilled; *Civitas septicollis diruetur, & Judex tremendus judicabit populum suum:* "The seven-hilled City shall be ruined, and the terrible "Judge shall judge his People. Or rather that of *Obadiah*: *Saviours shall come upon Mount Zion, to judge the Mount of Esau, and the Kingdom shall be the Lords.* Mich. 7. 16. Isa. 54. 11. *Messingham Florileg. Hibernic. p.* 378. Obad. v. 21.

(3) In the mean time, let the Church of God be comforted also in this, that the *bread of support* shall be given her, and the *water of consolation* shall be sure. Out of this Rock of Ages flowes a *River of living waters, the streams whereof shall make glad the City of God.* Nay, *with Honey out of the Rock shall they be satisfied*, while wandring in the Wilderness toward *Canaan*, and at last transported to the City of the *New Jerusalem*, which is above, where there's *fulness of joy*, and *pleasures for evermore*; where they shall be abundantly satisfied with the *Fatness* of that Heavenly Temple, and shall drink in the Rivers of the Cœlestial *Eden.* Isa. 33. 16. Psal. 46. 4. 81. 16. Psal. 16. 11. Psal. 36. 8. עדניך *Edenis tuæ.*

FINIS.